

08:33:09

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION

UNITED SERVICES AUTOMOBILE) (
ASSOCIATION) (
CIVIL ACTION NO.
VS.) (
2:18-CV-366-JRG
MARSHALL, TEXAS
JANUARY 10, 2020
WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.) (8:33 A.M.

TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL

ALL DAY

BEFORE THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUDGE RODNEY GILSTRAP,
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

JASON SHEASBY
ANTHONY ROWLES
LISA GLASSER
IRELL & MANELLA
1800 Avenue of the Stars
Suite 900
Los Angeles, CA 90067-4276

ROBERT CHRISTOPHER BUNT
PARKER, BUNT & AINSWORTH, PC
100 East Ferguson
Suite 418
Tyler, TX 75702

1 FOR THE DEFENDANT:

2
3 THOMAS M. MELSHEIMER
4 M. BRETT JOHNSON
5 MICHAEL A. BITTNER
6 J. TRAVIS UNDERWOOD
7 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
8 2121 North Pearl Street
9 Suite 900
10 Dallas, TX 75201

11 E. DANIELLE T. WILLIAMS
12 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
13 300 South Tyron Street
14 16th Floor
15 Charlotte, NC 28202

16 MATTHEW R. MCCULLOUGH
17 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
18 275 Middlefield Road
19 Suite 205
20 Menlo Park, CA 94025

21 JACK WESLEY HILL
22 WARD, SMITH & HILL, PLLC
23 P.O. Box 1231
24 1507 Bill Owens Parkway
25 Longview, TX 75606

18 COURT REPORTER: Shelly Holmes, CSR, TCRR
19 Official Court Reporter
20 United States District Court
21 Eastern District of Texas
22 Marshall Division
23 100 E. Houston
24 Marshall, Texas 75670
25 (903) 923-7464

23 (Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript
24 produced on a CAT system.)
25

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Jury out.)

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.

THE COURT: Be seated, please.

Are the parties prepared to read into the record those items from the list of pre-admitted exhibits used during yesterday's portion of the trial?

MR. BUNT: Yes, Your Honor, we are.

THE COURT: All right. Please proceed.

MR. BUNT: Your Honor, there were two Plaintiff's exhibits that came in yesterday. Those were PX-6 and PX-7.

THE COURT: Any objection to that rendition from the Defendant?

MR. UNDERWOOD: No objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Does Defendant have a similar rendition to offer for the record?

MR. UNDERWOOD: Defendant does not.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Sheasby, who's going to present closing arguments for the Plaintiff?

MR. SHEASBY: Your Honor, Mr. Bunt and I will be jointly presenting the closing arguments. Mr. Bunt would like a warning at seven minutes.

THE COURT: Mr. Bunt will go first?

MR. SHEASBY: Mr. Bunt will go first. We're going

08:35:35 1 to have 25 minutes in the opening, 15 in rebuttal.
08:35:39 2 Mr. Bunt would like a warning at seven minutes, and I would
08:35:44 3 like a warning at 20 minutes used, so five-minute, which is
08:35:54 4 probably an easier way of saying it.

08:36:00 5 And then in my rebuttal, I'd also respectfully
08:36:03 6 request a seven-minute warning.

08:36:06 7 THE COURT: All right. So in the first
08:36:08 8 Plaintiff's closing argument, both of you are going to
08:36:12 9 argue?

08:36:12 10 MR. SHEASBY: Yes.

08:36:13 11 THE COURT: And Mr. Bunt is going to start?

08:36:14 12 MR. SHEASBY: Yes.

08:36:15 13 THE COURT: And I'm going to warn Mr. Bunt when
08:36:17 14 he's used seven minutes?

08:36:19 15 MR. SHEASBY: Yes, Your Honor.

08:36:20 16 THE COURT: And then you all will decide when he
08:36:22 17 stops and when you start?

08:36:23 18 MR. SHEASBY: Yes, Your Honor.

08:36:24 19 THE COURT: And then you'd like a warning at what
08:36:26 20 point after that?

08:36:27 21 MR. SHEASBY: Five minutes left, Your Honor.

08:36:29 22 THE COURT: At 20 minutes?

08:36:30 23 MR. SHEASBY: Yes, yes, Your Honor.

08:36:31 24 THE COURT: At 20 minutes used. And then you'll
08:36:35 25 do the final close -- --

08:36:36 1 MR. SHEASBY: Yes, Your Honor.

08:36:37 2 THE COURT: -- closing argument? And on that you
08:36:40 3 want five minutes remaining?

08:36:43 4 MR. SHEASBY: Yes, Your Honor.

08:36:44 5 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Melsheimer, who's
08:36:51 6 going to present closing arguments for Defendant?

08:36:53 7 MR. MELSHEIMER: Your Honor, I will, along with
08:36:55 8 Ms. Williams.

08:36:58 9 THE COURT: And you want warnings on your time?

08:37:01 10 MR. MELSHEIMER: I do, Your Honor. I would
08:37:03 11 like -- we're going to split it 20/20.

08:37:07 12 THE COURT: You're going to begin?

08:37:08 13 MR. MELSHEIMER: I am.

08:37:09 14 THE COURT: Okay.

08:37:09 15 MR. MELSHEIMER: And so I would like a warning
08:37:11 16 when I've used 15 minutes of my 20, and Ms. Williams would
08:37:15 17 like a warning when she has used 15 minutes of her 20.

08:37:20 18 THE COURT: Well, I don't have any way of knowing
08:37:22 19 that you will stop exactly on 20 minutes and she will
08:37:26 20 start. So I'll warn you when 15 minutes have been used.
08:37:30 21 That will tell you you've got five minutes remaining. You
08:37:34 22 will either stop at exactly 20 minutes or you'll keep going
08:37:37 23 or you'll stop early. But whenever you stop, she'll start,
08:37:41 24 and I'll warn her when she has five minutes left. Will
08:37:44 25 that work?

08:37:44 1 MR. MELSHEIMER: That will work. There's --
08:37:46 2 there's grave concern on this side that I will keep
08:37:47 3 talking.

08:37:48 4 THE COURT: That had nothing to do with the
08:37:49 5 questions I asked.

08:38:14 6 All right. Just to make sure I have this right.
08:38:17 7 Plaintiff's first closing argument, Mr. Bunt will begin.
08:38:20 8 I'll warn him when he has used seven minutes. At some
08:38:24 9 point, he and Mr. Sheasby will tag out, and I'll tell
08:38:29 10 Mr. Sheasby when 20 minutes have been used.

08:38:33 11 Then for Defendant's closing, Mr. Melsheimer will
08:38:37 12 start. I'll tell him when 15 minutes have been used. He
08:38:41 13 and Ms. Williams will tag in and out, and when she has five
08:38:47 14 minutes left, I will tell her.

08:38:48 15 On Plaintiff's final closing, whatever time is
08:38:51 16 left -- Plaintiff will have, and I'll tell Mr. Sheasby when
08:38:54 17 he has five minutes remaining.

08:38:56 18 Do I have that right?

08:38:57 19 MR. SHEASBY: Yes, Your Honor.

08:38:59 20 MR. MELSHEIMER: You do, Your Honor.

08:39:00 21 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

08:39:01 22 Do either Plaintiff or Defendant have anything
08:39:06 23 else that the Court needs to hear before I bring in the
08:39:09 24 jury and we begin with the Court's final jury instructions?

08:39:12 25 MR. SHEASBY: Nothing from Plaintiffs, Your Honor.

08:39:13 1 MR. MELSHEIMER: Nothing here, Your Honor.

08:39:14 2 THE COURT: All right. I will say this before I
08:39:18 3 bring in the jury, and this is directed not only to counsel
08:39:22 4 but everyone present, including our guests behind the bar.

08:39:27 5 The Court's final instructions to the jury and
08:39:29 6 counsel's closing arguments are, in the Court's view, the
08:39:35 7 most serious part of a very serious process.

08:39:38 8 Those of you that are behind the bar in the
08:39:40 9 gallery, I don't want any whispering. I don't want any
08:39:43 10 talking. I sure don't want to hear any cell phone noises.
08:39:48 11 And if you need to get up to come and go, get up and come
08:39:55 12 and go now.

08:39:56 13 I don't want people walking in and out of the
08:39:57 14 courtroom unnecessarily. I want people to remain as quiet
08:39:58 15 and as still as possible. I don't want anything that might
08:40:00 16 distract the jury from my final instructions to them or
08:40:04 17 from counsels' closing arguments.

08:40:06 18 All right. With that, let's please bring in the
08:40:10 19 jury.

08:40:21 20 COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.

08:40:22 21 (Jury in.)

08:40:23 22 THE COURT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.
08:40:40 23 Please be seated.

08:40:40 24 Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, you've now heard
08:40:56 25 the evidence in this case. And I'll now instruct you on

08:40:59 1 the law that you must apply.

08:41:01 2 Each of you, as I told you yesterday, will have
08:41:05 3 your own printed copy of these final jury instructions.
08:41:09 4 You're welcome -- you're welcome to make notes as I give
08:41:12 5 these instructions to you orally, but I want you to
08:41:14 6 understand, you'll have your own printed copy for your own
08:41:17 7 review in the jury room when you retire.

08:41:19 8 It's your duty to follow the law as I give it to
08:41:25 9 you. On the other hand, ladies and gentlemen, as I've said
08:41:29 10 previously, you, the jury, are the sole judges of the facts
08:41:33 11 in this case.

08:41:35 12 Do not consider any statement that I have made
08:41:37 13 over the course of the trial or that I make during these
08:41:40 14 instructions as an indication to you that I have any
08:41:44 15 opinion about the facts.

08:41:46 16 You're about to hear closing arguments from the
08:41:49 17 attorneys in the case. Statements and arguments from the
08:41:53 18 attorneys, I remind you, are not evidence, and they are not
08:41:59 19 instructions on the law. They're intended only to assist
08:42:02 20 the jury in understanding the evidence and the parties'
08:42:08 21 competing contentions.

08:42:09 22 A verdict form has been prepared for you. You
08:42:13 23 will take this verdict form with you when you retire to the
08:42:17 24 jury room. And when you've reached a unanimous decision
08:42:21 25 regarding the verdict, you will have your foreperson fill

08:42:24 1 in the banks regarding the questions in the verdict form
08:42:29 2 with your unanimous answers.

08:42:31 3 Sign the verdict form and date it. At that point,
08:42:36 4 the foreperson of the jury should notify the Court Security
08:42:39 5 Officer that the jury has reached a verdict.

08:42:40 6 Answer each question in the verdict form from the
08:42:46 7 facts as you find them to be. Do not decide who you think
08:42:50 8 should win this case and then answer the questions to reach
08:42:54 9 that result.

08:42:55 10 Again, ladies and gentlemen, your answers and your
08:42:59 11 verdict must be unanimous.

08:42:59 12 In determining whether any fact has been proven in
08:43:05 13 this case, you may, unless otherwise instructed, consider
08:43:08 14 the testimony of all the witnesses, regardless of who may
08:43:12 15 have called them, and you may consider the effect of all
08:43:16 16 the exhibits received into evidence, regardless of who may
08:43:20 17 have produced or presented them.

08:43:22 18 You, the jury, are the sole judges of the
08:43:26 19 credibility and believability of each and every witness and
08:43:31 20 the weight and effect, if any, to give to the evidence
08:43:35 21 that's been presented to you in this case.

08:43:36 22 Now, I've told you previously that the attorneys
08:43:41 23 are acting as advocates for their competing parties and
08:43:45 24 those parties' competing claims, and they have a duty to
08:43:49 25 object when they believe evidence is offered during the

08:43:52 1 course of the trial that they believe should not be
08:43:55 2 admitted under the rules of the Court.

08:43:57 3 In that case, when the Court has sustained an
08:44:02 4 objection to a question addressed to a witness, you must
08:44:05 5 disregard the question entirely, and you may not draw any
08:44:10 6 inferences from its wording or speculate about how the
08:44:13 7 witness would have answered the question if I had allowed
08:44:16 8 them to answer the question.

08:44:17 9 On the other hand, if an objection has been
08:44:21 10 overruled by the Court, then you are to consider the
08:44:24 11 question and the answer just as if no objection had been
08:44:28 12 made, like any other question and answer.

08:44:30 13 Now, at various times during the course of the
08:44:34 14 trial, it's been necessary for the Court to talk to the
08:44:37 15 lawyers, either here at the bench or when you were outside
08:44:41 16 of the courtroom in the jury room.

08:44:43 17 This happens because during a trial, there are
08:44:47 18 things that you -- that occasionally arise that do not
08:44:50 19 involve the jury. You should not speculate, ladies and
08:44:54 20 gentlemen, about what was said during any of the
08:44:57 21 discussions that took place outside of your presence.

08:44:59 22 Now, there are two types of evidence that you may
08:45:04 23 consider in properly finding the truth as to the facts in
08:45:07 24 this case.

08:45:08 25 One is direct evidence, such as the testimony of

08:45:11 1 an eyewitness.

08:45:12 2 The other is indirect evidence, or sometimes
08:45:16 3 called circumstantial evidence, which is the proof of a
08:45:19 4 chain of circumstances that indicates the existence or
08:45:25 5 non-existence of certain other facts.

08:45:25 6 As a general rule, you should know that the law
08:45:29 7 makes no distinction between direct evidence and
08:45:32 8 circumstantial evidence but simply requires that you, the
08:45:37 9 jury, find the facts based on the evidence that has been
08:45:40 10 presented, both direct and circumstantial.

08:45:43 11 Now, the parties may have stipulated or agreed to
08:45:49 12 some facts in this case. And when the lawyers for both
08:45:51 13 sides stipulate as to the existence of a fact, you must,
08:45:55 14 unless otherwise instructed, accept that stipulation as
08:45:59 15 evidence and regard that fact as proven.

08:46:01 16 Certain testimony in this case has been presented
08:46:05 17 to you through depositions. A deposition is the sworn,
08:46:10 18 recorded answers to questions asked to a witness in advance
08:46:15 19 of the trial. If a witness cannot be present to testify in
08:46:19 20 person, then the witness's testimony may be presented under
08:46:23 21 oath in the form of a deposition.

08:46:24 22 As I told you earlier, before the trial, the
08:46:28 23 attorneys representing the parties in this case questioned
08:46:31 24 these deposition witnesses under oath. At that time, a
08:46:35 25 court reporter was present, and their recorded testimony

08:46:39 1 was transcribed and written down.

08:46:42 2 Both sides have had an opportunity to contribute
08:46:45 3 portions of that testimony to those deposition witnesses
08:46:49 4 that have presented -- have been presented to you as a part
08:46:52 5 of this trial in open court.

08:46:55 6 Deposition testimony is entitled to the same
08:46:58 7 consideration by you as testimony given by a witness who
08:47:06 8 appears in person and testifies live from the witness
08:47:11 9 stand.

08:47:11 10 Accordingly, you should judge the credibility and
08:47:14 11 the importance of deposition testimony to the best of your
08:47:18 12 ability just as if the witness had testified from the
08:47:20 13 witness stand in open court.

08:47:22 14 Now, while you should consider only the evidence
08:47:25 15 in this case, ladies and gentlemen, you should understand
08:47:28 16 that you are permitted to draw such reasonable inferences
08:47:32 17 from the testimony and exhibits as you feel are justified
08:47:36 18 in the light of common experience.

08:47:42 19 In other words, ladies and gentlemen, you may make
08:47:44 20 deductions and reach conclusions that reason and common
08:47:50 21 sense lead you to draw from the facts that have been
08:47:53 22 established by the testimony and evidence in this case.

08:47:55 23 However, you should not base your decisions on any
08:47:57 24 evidence not presented by the parties in open court during
08:48:03 25 the trial.

08:48:04 1 Now, unless I instruct you otherwise, you may
08:48:06 2 properly determine that the testimony of a single witness
08:48:11 3 is sufficient to prove any fact, even if a greater number
08:48:14 4 of witnesses may have testified to the contrary, if after
08:48:18 5 considering all of the evidence you believe that single
08:48:20 6 witness.

08:48:23 7 Now, when knowledge of a technical subject may be
08:48:26 8 helpful to the jury, a person who has special training and
08:48:30 9 experience in that technical field, called an expert
08:48:35 10 witness, is permitted to state his or her opinions on those
08:48:45 11 technical matters to the jury.

08:48:45 12 However, ladies and gentlemen, you're not required
08:48:46 13 to accept those opinions. As with any other witness, it is
08:48:49 14 solely up to you to decide who you believe and who you do
08:48:51 15 not believe, and whether or not you want to rely on their
08:48:59 16 testimony.

08:48:59 17 Now, over the course of the trial, certain
08:49:02 18 exhibits have been shown to you that were illustrations.
08:49:05 19 We call these demonstrative exhibits or sometimes just
08:49:08 20 demonstratives for short.

08:49:11 21 Demonstrative exhibits are a party's description,
08:49:13 22 picture, model, or drawing to describe something involved
08:49:23 23 in the trial.

08:49:23 24 If your recollection of the evidence differs from
08:49:24 25 these demonstratives, then you should rely on your

08:49:26 1 recollection.

08:49:27 2 Demonstrative exhibits are sometimes called jury
08:49:29 3 aids. And the demonstrative itself is not evidence, ladies
08:49:33 4 and gentlemen, and I cannot send demonstrative exhibits to
08:49:37 5 you in the jury room during your deliberations because it's
08:49:40 6 not evidence. But the witness's testimony given during the
08:49:47 7 use of a demonstrative is evidence.

08:49:51 8 Now, in any legal action facts must be proven by a
08:49:56 9 required amount of evidence known as the burden of proof.
08:50:00 10 The burden -- the burden of proof in this case is on the
08:50:02 11 Plaintiff, USAA, for some issues, and it's on the
08:50:05 12 Defendant, Wells Fargo, for other issues.

08:50:08 13 There are two burdens of proof that you will apply
08:50:11 14 in this case. One is the preponderance of the evidence,
08:50:16 15 and the other is clear and convincing evidence.

08:50:19 16 The Plaintiff, USAA, has the burden of proof of
08:50:23 17 proving patent infringement by a preponderance of the
08:50:27 18 evidence. USAA also has the burden of proving willful
08:50:31 19 patent infringement by a preponderance of the evidence.
08:50:35 20 And USAA has the burden of proving damages for any patent
08:50:41 21 infringement by a preponderance of the evidence.

08:50:43 22 Now, preponderance of the evidence means evidence
08:50:47 23 that persuades you that a claim is more probably true than
08:50:51 24 not true. Sometimes this is talked about as being the
08:50:55 25 greater weight and degree of credible testimony.

08:50:58 1 The Defendant in this case, Wells Fargo, has the
08:51:04 2 burden of proof of proving patent invalidity by clear and
08:51:07 3 convincing evidence.

08:51:09 4 Clear and convincing evidence means evidence that
08:51:12 5 produces in your mind an abiding conviction in the truth of
08:51:18 6 the party's fact -- let me say that again.

08:51:22 7 Clear and convincing evidence means evidence that
08:51:25 8 produces in your mind an abiding conviction that the truth
08:51:29 9 of the party's factual contentions are highly probable.

08:51:33 10 Although proof to an absolute certainty is not
08:51:37 11 required, the clear and convincing evidence standard
08:51:40 12 requires a greater degree of persuasion than is necessary
08:51:44 13 for the preponderance of the evidence standard.

08:51:47 14 If the proof establishes in your mind an abiding
08:51:51 15 conviction in the truth of the matter, then the clear and
08:51:54 16 convincing evidence standard has been met.

08:51:59 17 Now, as I've previously told you, ladies and
08:52:02 18 gentlemen, these two burdens of proof are not to be
08:52:05 19 confused with the burden of proof known as beyond a
08:52:10 20 reasonable doubt, which is the burden of proof applied in a
08:52:11 21 criminal case, not in a civil case such as this.

08:52:14 22 You should not confuse clear and convincing
08:52:18 23 evidence with beyond a reasonable doubt. It is not as high
08:52:22 24 as beyond a reasonable doubt, but it is higher than a
08:52:25 25 preponderance of the evidence.

08:52:26 1 Now, in determining whether any fact has been
08:52:31 2 proven by a preponderance of the evidence or by clear and
08:52:34 3 convincing evidence, you may, unless otherwise instructed,
08:52:39 4 consider the stipulations of the parties, the testimony of
08:52:42 5 all the witnesses, regardless of who called them, and all
08:52:45 6 the exhibits received and admitted into evidence during the
08:52:49 7 course of the trial, regardless of who may have produced
08:52:52 8 them or presented them.

08:52:53 9 Now, as I did at the beginning of the case, I'll
08:52:58 10 give you a summary of each side's contentions, and then
08:53:01 11 I'll provide you with detailed instructions on what each
08:53:04 12 side must prove to win on each of its contentions.

08:53:07 13 As I told you previously, this case concerns two
08:53:12 14 United States patents, those being U.S. Patent No.
08:53:20 15 10,013,681, and United States Patent No. 10,1 -- excuse me,
08:53:28 16 10,013,605, which have consistently been referred to
08:53:33 17 throughout the trial as the '681 patent and the '605
08:53:35 18 patent. And they have been referred to throughout the
08:53:42 19 trial at various times as the patents-in-suit. Sometimes
08:53:45 20 they've been called the asserted patents.

08:53:47 21 Now, the Plaintiff, USAA, seeks money damages from
08:53:52 22 Wells Fargo, the Defendant, for allegedly infringing the
08:53:56 23 patents-in-suit by making, using, selling, or offering for
08:54:05 24 sale in the United States the Wells Fargo Mobile Deposit
08:54:07 25 system. Sometimes in these instructions, I'll refer to

08:54:10 1 that system for shorthand as the accused product.

08:54:15 2 USAA contends that the accused product infringes
08:54:18 3 the following claims: Claim 1, Claim 3, Claim 11 through
08:54:24 4 14, and Claim 22 of the '605 patent, and Claims 12 through
08:54:32 5 14, Claim 20, Claim 22, and Claim 30 of the '681 patent.

08:54:37 6 These -- these claims are sometimes referred to
08:54:41 7 collectively as the asserted claims.

08:54:45 8 USAA has alleged that the accused product
08:54:50 9 infringes the asserted claims. USA -- USAA also alleges
08:54:57 10 that Wells Fargo's infringement is and has been willful.

08:55:01 11 USAA seeks damages in the form of a reasonable
08:55:06 12 royalty for Wells Fargo's alleged infringement.

08:55:08 13 Wells Fargo, the Defendant, denies that the
08:55:13 14 accused product infringes any of the asserted claims of the
08:55:20 15 '681 patent and the '605 patent.

08:55:22 16 Wells Fargo further denies USAA's allegation that
08:55:27 17 it willfully infringed any claim of the asserted patents.

08:55:35 18 Wells Fargo also contends that the asserted claims
08:55:37 19 are invalid, and Wells Fargo denies that it owes USAA any
08:55:41 20 damages in this case.

08:55:43 21 It's your job, members of the jury, to decide
08:55:49 22 whether USAA has proven that Wells Fargo has infringed any
08:55:53 23 of the asserted claims and whether any infringement is
08:55:57 24 willful. You must also decide whether Wells Fargo has
08:56:01 25 proven that any of the asserted claims are invalid.

08:56:04 1 If you decide that any of the asserted claims have
08:56:10 2 been infringed and are not invalid, then you will need to
08:56:17 3 decide whether any money damages should be awarded and what
08:56:20 4 amount those money damages should be to compensate USAA for
08:56:24 5 that infringement.

08:56:25 6 I'll now instruct you on a number of established
08:56:31 7 facts, and you must take these facts as true when deciding
08:56:34 8 the issues in this case.

08:56:35 9 No. 1, USAA is the record assignee and owner of
08:56:44 10 the '605 and the '681 patents;

08:56:45 11 No. 2, the asserted claims of the '605 patent are
08:56:50 12 Claims 1, 3, 11 through 14, and 22;

08:56:54 13 No. 3, the asserted claims of the '681 patent are
08:56:58 14 Claims 12 through 14, 20, 22, and 30;

08:57:03 15 No. 4, it's an established fact that the system
08:57:10 16 accused of infringement satisfies the following limitations
08:57:12 17 of the claims:

08:57:15 18 The '605 patent, Claim 1, quote, an image capture
08:57:21 19 and processing system for use with a digital camera, the
08:57:24 20 image capture and processing system comprising: A portable
08:57:29 21 device comprising a general purpose computer including a
08:57:33 22 processor coupled to a memory, the memory storing, close
08:57:38 23 quote.

08:57:38 24 Next, '605 patent, Claim 12, quote, a system for
08:57:49 25 allowing a customer to deposit a check using the customer's

08:57:51 1 own handheld mobile device with a digital camera, the
08:57:54 2 system configured to authenticate the customer, the system
08:57:58 3 including, close quote.

08:58:00 4 Next, all other instances in Claim 1 and Claim 12
08:58:06 5 of the '605 patent of the term "mobile device" or the term
08:58:11 6 "portable device."

08:58:12 7 Next, '681 patent, Claim 12, quote, a system for
08:58:18 8 allowing a customer to deposit a check using the customer's
08:58:23 9 own mobile device with a digital camera, the system
08:58:26 10 configured to ask the customer to log in using a customer
08:58:32 11 name and password, the system including, close quote.

08:58:35 12 Next, '681 patent, Claim 30, quote, a
08:58:41 13 non-transitory computer-readable medium storing an app
08:58:45 14 that, when downloaded -- downloaded and run by a customer's
08:58:49 15 mobile device, causes the customer's mobile device to
08:58:54 16 perform, close quote.

08:58:55 17 Next, all other instances in Claims 12, 20, and 30
08:59:00 18 of the '681 patent of the term "mobile device."

08:59:03 19 Now, before you can decide many of the issues in
08:59:10 20 this case, you will need to understand the role of the
08:59:12 21 patent claims.

08:59:14 22 The claims of a patent, ladies and gentlemen, are
08:59:17 23 the numbered sentences at the end of the patent. The
08:59:21 24 claims define the owner's rights under the law. The claims
08:59:27 25 are important because it's the words of the claims

08:59:29 1 themselves that define what the patent covers.

08:59:36 2 The figures and the text in the rest of the patent
08:59:38 3 are intended to provide a description or examples of the
08:59:41 4 invention and to provide a context for the claims, but it
08:59:44 5 is the claims themselves that define the breadth of the
08:59:48 6 patent's coverage.

08:59:48 7 Each claim is effectively treated as if it were
08:59:53 8 its own separate patent, and each claim may cover more or
08:59:57 9 may cover less than any other claim. Therefore, what a
09:00:02 10 patent covers collectively or as a whole depends on what
09:00:07 11 each of its claims cover.

09:00:09 12 You first need to understand what each claim
09:00:12 13 covers in order to decide whether or not there is
09:00:16 14 infringement of that claim and to decide whether or not the
09:00:19 15 claim is invalid. And the first step is to understand the
09:00:24 16 meaning of the words used in the patent claim.

09:00:28 17 Now, the law says that it's my role as the Judge
09:00:34 18 to define the terms of the claims, but it's your role as
09:00:37 19 the jury to apply my definitions to the issues that you're
09:00:40 20 asked to decide in this case.

09:00:41 21 Accordingly, and as I explained to you at the
09:00:47 22 beginning of the case, I have already determined the
09:00:49 23 meaning of certain claim language, and I've provided
09:00:52 24 definitions of those claim terms to you in your juror
09:00:56 25 notebooks.

09:00:57 1 You must accept my definitions of those words in
09:01:02 2 the claims as being correct, and it's your job to take
09:01:05 3 these definitions that I have supplied and apply them to
09:01:09 4 the issues that you are asked to decide, including the
09:01:13 5 issues of infringement and invalidity.

09:01:15 6 My interpretation of the claim terms should not be
09:01:20 7 taken by you as an indication that I have a view regarding
09:01:24 8 the issues of infringement and invalidity. The decisions
09:01:28 9 regarding infringement and invalidity are yours alone to
09:01:34 10 make.

09:01:34 11 For claim limitations where I have not construed
09:01:36 12 the language or defined or interpreted any particular term,
09:01:40 13 you are to use the plain and ordinary meaning of that term
09:01:44 14 as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, which is
09:01:50 15 to say in the field of the technology of the patent at the
09:01:53 16 time of the alleged invention.

09:01:57 17 The meaning of the words of the patent claims must
09:01:59 18 be the same when deciding the issues of infringement and
09:02:02 19 when deciding the issues of invalidity.

09:02:06 20 I'll now explain how a claim defines what it
09:02:11 21 covers.

09:02:11 22 A claim sets forth in words a set of requirements.
09:02:15 23 Each claim sets forth its requirements in a single
09:02:19 24 sentence. If a device satisfies each of these requirements
09:02:22 25 in that sentence, then it is covered by and infringes the

09:02:27 1 claim.

09:02:28 2 There can be several claims in a patent. A claim
09:02:32 3 may be narrower or broader than any other claim by setting
09:02:35 4 forth more or fewer requirements. The coverage of a patent
09:02:40 5 is assessed on a claim-by-claim basis.

09:02:42 6 In patent law, the requirements of a claim are
09:02:48 7 often referred to as the claim elements. They're sometimes
09:02:52 8 called the claim limitations.

09:02:54 9 When a product meets all of the requirements of a
09:02:56 10 claim, where it meets all of its limitations or elements,
09:03:01 11 then the claim is said to cover that product, and the
09:03:05 12 product is said to fall within the scope of that claim. In
09:03:10 13 other words, a claim covers a product where each of the
09:03:13 14 claim elements or limitations is present in that product.

09:03:21 15 If a product is missing even one limitation or
09:03:25 16 element of a claim, the product is not covered by the
09:03:27 17 claim. And if the product is not covered by the claim, the
09:03:31 18 product does not infringe the claim.

09:03:32 19 Now, this case involves two types of patent
09:03:35 20 claims, independent claims and dependent claims.

09:03:39 21 An independent patent claim does not refer to any
09:03:42 22 other claim in the patent. An independent claim sets forth
09:03:47 23 all the requirements that must be met in order to be
09:03:50 24 covered by that claim. It's not necessary to look at any
09:03:54 25 other claim to determine what an independent claim covers.

09:03:57 1 On the other hand, a dependent claim does not by
09:04:02 2 itself recite all the requirements of a claim but refers to
09:04:08 3 another claim or claims for some of its requirements. In
09:04:11 4 this way, the dependent claim depends on another claim, or
09:04:17 5 we sometimes say refers to another claim.

09:04:22 6 The law considers a dependent claim to incorporate
09:04:26 7 all the requirements of the claim or claims to which it
09:04:30 8 refers or depends, as well as the additional claims set
09:04:33 9 forth -- the additional elements set forth in the dependent
09:04:39 10 claim itself.

09:04:40 11 To determine what a dependent claim covers, it's
09:04:42 12 necessary to look at both the dependent claim and any other
09:04:47 13 claim to which it refers or from which it depends.

09:04:52 14 A product that meets all the requirements of both
09:04:54 15 the dependent claim itself and the claim or claims to which
09:04:58 16 it refers, or as we say from which it depends, is covered
09:05:03 17 by that dependent claim.

09:05:07 18 The claims of the patents-in-suit use the word
09:05:09 19 "comprising." Comprising means including or containing.
09:05:15 20 When the word "comprising" is used, a product that includes
09:05:19 21 all the limitations or elements of the claim, as well as
09:05:24 22 additional elements or limitations, is covered by the
09:05:26 23 claim.

09:05:27 24 Some of the claims of the patents-in-suit use the
09:05:31 25 word "including." In a claim, including means comprising.

09:05:37 1 For example, if you take a claim that covers the
09:05:40 2 invention of a table, if the claim recites a table
09:05:44 3 comprising a tabletop, four legs, and glue that holds the
09:05:50 4 legs to the tabletop, that claim will cover any table that
09:05:54 5 contains those structures, even if the table also contains
09:06:00 6 other structures, such as leaves to go in the tabletop or
09:06:05 7 wheels to be added to the ends of the legs.

09:06:07 8 Now, that's a simple example using the word
09:06:10 9 "comprising" and what it means. In other words, an accused
09:06:13 10 product can have other features in addition to those
09:06:16 11 covered by the patent and still infringe a patent's claim
09:06:22 12 so long as every element or limitation of the claim is
09:06:24 13 present.

09:06:25 14 If a product is missing even one element or
09:06:31 15 limitation of a claim, it does not meet all the
09:06:33 16 requirements of the claim and is not covered by the claim.
09:06:36 17 And as I've said, if it's not covered by the claim, it does
09:06:39 18 not infringe the claim.

09:06:40 19 If a person makes, uses, sells, or offers for sale
09:06:49 20 within the United States or imports into the United States
09:06:53 21 a product that is covered by a patent claim without the
09:06:56 22 patent owner's permission, that person is said to infringe
09:07:01 23 the patent.

09:07:01 24 To determine whether there is infringement, you
09:07:05 25 must compare the asserted patent claims as I have defined

09:07:10 1 each of them to the accused product. You should not
09:07:13 2 compare the accused product with any specific example set
09:07:18 3 out in the patent or with the patent owner's own commercial
09:07:23 4 product or with the prior art in reaching your -- your
09:07:26 5 decision on infringement.

09:07:27 6 As I've reminded you during the trial, the only
09:07:32 7 correct comparison is between the accused product and the
09:07:36 8 language of the claims themselves.

09:07:39 9 You must reach your decision as to each assertion
09:07:43 10 of infringement based on my instructions about the meaning
09:07:46 11 and the scope of the claims, the legal requirements for
09:07:50 12 infringement, and the evidence presented to you by both of
09:07:56 13 the parties.

09:07:56 14 As I've already told you, to prove infringement,
09:07:59 15 USAA, the Plaintiff, must prove by a preponderance of the
09:08:03 16 evidence that the Defendant, Wells Fargo, has made, used,
09:08:07 17 sold, or offered for sale a product that meets all the
09:08:10 18 requirements of an asserted claim -- that is, USAA must
09:08:15 19 show that it is more likely than not that the accused
09:08:19 20 product meets all the requirements of an asserted claim.

09:08:21 21 If the accused product does not include any single
09:08:28 22 step or element of an asserted patent claim, then Wells
09:08:31 23 Fargo does not infringe that claim.

09:08:35 24 The issue of infringement, ladies and gentlemen,
09:08:37 25 is based on a claim-by-claim -- it's assessed on a

09:08:41 1 claim-by-claim basis within each patent. Therefore, there
09:08:45 2 may be infringement of a particular patent as to one claim,
09:08:49 3 even if there's no infringement as to the other claims in
09:08:52 4 that patent.

09:08:52 5 In order to infringe a patent claim, the accused
09:08:57 6 device must include each and every element of the claim.
09:09:01 7 In determining whether Wells Fargo infringes USAA's
09:09:06 8 asserted claims, you must determine if the accused product
09:09:10 9 contains each and every element recited in a claim of the
09:09:15 10 asserted patent.

09:09:16 11 A claim element is present if it exists in the
09:09:21 12 accused product as it is described in the claim language,
09:09:24 13 either as I have explained it to you, or if I did not
09:09:28 14 explain it, according to its -- if I did not explain it,
09:09:32 15 according to its ordinary meaning as understood by one of
09:09:36 16 ordinary skill in the art.

09:09:36 17 To establish direct infringement of a dependent
09:09:43 18 claim, the Plaintiff, USAA, must show that it is more
09:09:45 19 likely than not that the Defendant, Wells Fargo, infringed
09:09:51 20 each and every element of the independent claim to which
09:09:54 21 the dependent claim refers and the additional elements of
09:09:57 22 the dependent claim itself.

09:09:58 23 A patent can be infringed, ladies and gentlemen,
09:10:05 24 even if the alleged infringer did not have knowledge of the
09:10:10 25 patent and without the infringer knowing that what it is

09:10:13 1 doing is infringement of the claim.

09:10:14 2 A patent may also be infringed -- infringed even
09:10:17 3 though the accused infringer believes in good faith that
09:10:22 4 what it is doing is not infringement of the patent.

09:10:25 5 As I just mentioned, infringement requires a party
09:10:33 6 to make, use, sell, or offer to sell each and every
09:10:38 7 component or step of a claimed system or method. A party
09:10:42 8 makes a claimed system when it combines all of the elements
09:10:46 9 of the claims, even if it does not make each individual
09:10:50 10 component element.

09:10:52 11 A party uses a claimed system when it controls the
09:10:54 12 system and obtains benefits from it. A party obtains a
09:11:03 13 benefit from a system if it obtains a benefit from each and
09:11:04 14 every element of the claimed system.

09:11:06 15 A party does not have to exercise physical or
09:11:08 16 direct control over each element of the system in order to
09:11:15 17 use the claimed system.

09:11:16 18 Infringement requires a single party be
09:11:20 19 responsible for infringement of the claim. Where more than
09:11:24 20 one party is involved in the system accused of
09:11:27 21 infringement, you must determine whether the acts of one
09:11:30 22 party are attributable to another party such that a single
09:11:34 23 party is responsible for the infringement.

09:11:36 24 In this case, USAA contends that Wells Fargo
09:11:41 25 willfully infringed its patents. If you decide that Wells

09:11:47 1 Fargo has infringed, you must then go on to separately
09:11:51 2 address the additional issue of whether or not Wells
09:11:54 3 Fargo's infringement was willful.

09:11:56 4 USAA must prove willfulness by a preponderance of
09:12:02 5 the evidence. In other words, you must determine whether
09:12:04 6 it is more likely than not that Wells Fargo willfully
09:12:09 7 infringed the asserted patents.

09:12:10 8 You may not determine that infringement was
09:12:15 9 willful just because Wells Fargo knew of the asserted
09:12:19 10 patents and infringed them. However, you may find that
09:12:23 11 Wells Fargo willfully infringed if you find that it acted
09:12:30 12 egregiously, willfully, or wantonly. You may find Wells
09:12:35 13 Fargo's actions were egregious, willful, or wanton if it
09:12:39 14 acted in reckless or callous disregard of or with
09:12:45 15 indifference to the rights of USAA.

09:12:47 16 A Defendant is indifferent to the rights of
09:12:49 17 another when it proceeds in disregard of a high or
09:12:51 18 excessive danger of infringement that was known to it or
09:12:57 19 was apparent to a reasonable person in its position.

09:13:00 20 Your determination of willfulness should
09:13:03 21 incorporate the totality of the circumstances based on all
09:13:09 22 the evidence presented during the trial. Willfulness can
09:13:12 23 be established by circumstantial evidence.

09:13:17 24 For example, in determining whether any
09:13:19 25 infringement of an asserted claim by Wells Fargo was

09:13:22 1 willful, you may consider whether Wells Fargo intentionally
09:13:27 2 copied a product that is covered by the asserted claim.
09:13:37 3 However, such copying will be relevant to willfulness only
09:13:37 4 if it copied the product -- only if the copied product is
09:13:39 5 covered by the asserted claims.

09:13:40 6 Knowledge of the existence of a patent or patent
09:13:45 7 family can be relevant to the question of willful
09:13:48 8 infringement.

09:13:50 9 For example, if Wells Fargo knew of the existence
09:13:53 10 of a patent or subjectively believed there was a high
09:13:59 11 probability that a patent existed and took deliberate
09:14:02 12 actions to avoid learning of the patent, you may take this
09:14:06 13 into account when considering willfulness. You may also
09:14:09 14 take into account whether Wells Fargo had knowledge of a
09:14:11 15 patent family.

09:14:11 16 I'll now instruct you on the rules that you must
09:14:18 17 follow in deciding whether or not Wells Fargo has proven by
09:14:22 18 clear and convincing evidence that the asserted claims of
09:14:24 19 the patents-in-suit are invalid.

09:14:25 20 An issued patent, ladies and gentlemen, is
09:14:32 21 accorded a presumption of validity based on the presumption
09:14:36 22 that the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office office, as you've
09:14:40 23 heard referred to throughout the trial as the PTO or as the
09:14:43 24 Patent Office, acted correctly in issuing the patents.
09:14:51 25 This presumption of validity extends to all issued United

09:14:55 1 States patents.

09:14:55 2 In order to overcome that presumption, Wells Fargo
09:14:59 3 must establish by clear and convincing evidence that USAA's
09:15:01 4 patents or any claim in the patents are not valid.

09:15:07 5 The time it took the U.S. Patent and Trademark
09:15:10 6 Office office to examine and grant the patents-in-suit is
09:15:13 7 not relevant to any issue in this case. Even though the
09:15:16 8 PTO examiner has allowed the claims of a patent, you have
09:15:19 9 the ultimate responsibility of deciding whether the claims
09:15:22 10 of the patents-in-suit are valid. Like infringement,
09:15:27 11 invalidity is determined on a claim-by-claim basis.

09:15:33 12 Claims are construed in the same way for
09:15:35 13 determining infringement as for determining invalidity.
09:15:40 14 You must apply the claim language consistently and in the
09:15:44 15 same manner for issues of infringement and for issues of
09:15:47 16 invalidity. You must determine separately for each claim
09:15:51 17 whether that claim is invalid.

09:15:53 18 Now, at times, you will hear me make reference to
09:16:00 19 prior art. In patent law, a system, device, method,
09:16:04 20 publication, or patent that predated the patent claim at
09:16:09 21 issue is called prior art.

09:16:12 22 For a prior art reference to be considered for the
09:16:15 23 purpose of determining whether or not the claims are
09:16:18 24 invalid, the prior art item or reference must have been
09:16:22 25 made, known, used, filed, or published more than a year

09:16:28 1 before the effective filing date of the patent, which
09:16:34 2 you -- which you've heard referred to throughout this case
09:16:36 3 at various times at the priority date.

09:16:39 4 The parties disagree on the priority date of the
09:16:43 5 '605 and the '681 patents.

09:16:45 6 The Plaintiff, USAA, contends that the patents are
09:16:49 7 entitled to a priority date of October 31st, 2006. The
09:16:54 8 Defendant, Wells Fargo, contends that the patents are
09:16:58 9 entitled to a priority date of July the 28th, 2017.

09:17:01 10 The patents-in-suit were filed on July the 28th,
09:17:09 11 2017. Therefore, they're entitled to at least a priority
09:17:13 12 date of July 28th, 2017.

09:17:15 13 To determine whether Wells Fargo has met its
09:17:21 14 burden -- burden to show by clear and convincing evidence
09:17:24 15 that the asserted patents are not entitled to a priority
09:17:27 16 date of October 31, 2006, you will need to determine
09:17:34 17 whether the patent specification filed on October 31, 2006,
09:17:40 18 in the parent application satisfies the written description
09:17:45 19 requirement for the asserted claims filed in 2017.

09:17:52 20 If Wells Fargo does not meet this burden, the
09:17:55 21 asserted patents are entitled to a priority date of October
09:17:57 22 31, 2006.

09:18:07 23 As I've previously explained, to obtain a patent,
09:18:07 24 one must first file an application with the United States
09:18:08 25 Patent and Trademark Office. The process of obtaining a

09:18:12 1 patent is called patent prosecution.

09:18:14 2 The application submitted to the PTO includes
09:18:18 3 within it what is called a specification. The
09:18:22 4 specification is required to contain a written description
09:18:27 5 of the claimed invention telling what the invention is, how
09:18:30 6 it works, how to make it, and how to use it.

09:18:36 7 The patentee may later file an additional patent
09:18:40 8 application based on the same specification as the original
09:18:44 9 application but with different claims. These follow-on
09:18:47 10 applications are called continuations because they are a
09:18:52 11 continuation of the original patent application.

09:18:56 12 The original patent application is sometimes
09:18:59 13 called the parent application. Continuation applications
09:19:04 14 are based on the parent applications -- excuse me,
09:19:08 15 continuation applications based on the parent application
09:19:12 16 are sometimes called children.

09:19:16 17 The combination of patents issued from the patent
09:19:20 18 application and from any continuation or child applications
09:19:25 19 are referred to as a patent family. Each issued patent in
09:19:31 20 a patent family is a separate property right.

09:19:33 21 In this case, the parent application of the '681
09:19:40 22 patent was filed on October 31, 2006, and published on
09:19:45 23 January the 18th, 2011. The parent application and the
09:19:52 24 '681 patent share the same specification.

09:19:54 25 The parent application of the '605 patent was

09:19:57 1 filed on October 31, 2006. The parent application was
09:20:02 2 published on April 29th, 2014. The parent application and
09:20:08 3 the '605 patent share the same specification.

09:20:11 4 Each patent, regardless of whether it is in the
09:20:18 5 same patent family, must be assessed individually with
09:20:21 6 respect to infringement, invalidity, marking, damages, and
09:20:27 7 willfulness. You are to assess each of these issues
09:20:30 8 independently for each asserted patent according to the
09:20:33 9 instructions that I give you.

09:20:35 10 I'll now instruct you on the rules that you must
09:20:40 11 follow in determining whether the asserted patents satisfy
09:20:43 12 the written description requirement.

09:20:46 13 Wells Fargo bears the burden of establishing by
09:20:52 14 clear and convincing evidence that the claims of the '605
09:20:56 15 patent and the '681 patent do not satisfy the written
09:21:00 16 description requirement.

09:21:01 17 A patent must contain a written description of the
09:21:07 18 invention claimed in the patent. The written description
09:21:10 19 requirement helps ensure that the patent applicant actually
09:21:14 20 invented the claimed subject matter.

09:21:18 21 To satisfy the written description requirement,
09:21:20 22 the patent specification must describe each and every
09:21:24 23 limitation of a patent claim in sufficient detail, although
09:21:28 24 the exact words found in the claim need not be used.

09:21:33 25 When determining whether the specification

09:21:36 1 discloses the invention, the claim must be viewed as a
09:21:40 2 whole.

09:21:43 3 In determining whether the patent satisfies this
09:21:45 4 written description requirement, you must consider the
09:21:48 5 description from the viewpoint of a person having ordinary
09:21:51 6 skill in the field of technology of the patent when the
09:21:54 7 application was filed.

09:21:59 8 The written description requirement is satisfied
09:22:01 9 if persons of ordinary skill in the field of the invention
09:22:05 10 would recognize from reading the patent specification that
09:22:08 11 the inventor possessed the subject matter finally claimed
09:22:12 12 in the patent.

09:22:12 13 The written description requirement is satisfied
09:22:17 14 if the specification shows that the inventor possessed his
09:22:22 15 or her invention as of the priority date of the claimed
09:22:25 16 invention even though the claims themselves may have been
09:22:32 17 changed or new claims added since that time.

09:22:35 18 The written description requirement may be
09:22:44 19 satisfied by any combination of the words, structures,
09:22:48 20 figures, diagrams, formulas, et cetera, contained in the
09:22:52 21 patent application.

09:22:58 22 It is unnecessary to spell out every detail of the
09:23:01 23 invention in the specification, and specific examples are
09:23:03 24 not required. Only enough must be included in the
09:23:08 25 specification to convince persons of ordinary skill in the

09:23:15 1 art that the inventor possessed the full scope of the
09:23:17 2 invention.

09:23:18 3 The patent specification need not disclose every
09:23:24 4 embodiment of the invention. Description in the
09:23:26 5 specification of as few as one example can be a sufficient
09:23:31 6 written description of a larger category of potential
09:23:35 7 embodiments of the invention.

09:23:37 8 However, the specification must describe the
09:23:39 9 claimed invention in a way that a person of ordinary skill
09:23:46 10 in the art would understand that the larger category is
09:23:48 11 being claimed -- that is being claimed has been invented,
09:23:51 12 not just a single example.

09:23:53 13 It's unnecessary for the patent applicant to
09:23:57 14 describe concepts relating to the invention that are
09:24:01 15 already well-known to persons of ordinary skill in the art.

09:24:06 16 In considering written description, be aware that
09:24:10 17 the actual possession of the invention outside of the
09:24:14 18 specification is not enough. Rather, as stated above, or
09:24:18 19 as I've told you, it is the specification itself that must
09:24:22 20 demonstrate possession such that one skilled in the art
09:24:25 21 reading the original disclosure could reasonably discern
09:24:29 22 the limitation at issue in a claim.

09:24:31 23 I'll now instruct you on the rules that you must
09:24:40 24 follow in determining whether the asserted claims are
09:24:42 25 anticipated.

09:24:42 1 For a claim to be invalid because it is not new or
09:24:47 2 anticipated, all of its requirements must have existed in a
09:24:51 3 single system that predates the asserted claims or must
09:24:55 4 have been described in a single printed publication or
09:24:58 5 patent that predates the asserted claims.

09:25:00 6 To understand how a prior art system operates, you
09:25:06 7 may rely on multiple pieces of evidence that describe the
09:25:09 8 same prior art system for the purpose of finding
09:25:12 9 anticipation.

09:25:15 10 In other words, if you find that a single prior
09:25:17 11 art system existed that meets every requirement of the
09:25:22 12 claim, then that is enough to find the claim invalid as
09:25:25 13 anticipated by the prior art.

09:25:28 14 The prior art must contain all the limitations of
09:25:32 15 the claim, arranged as in the claim.

09:25:37 16 Defendant must prove by clear and convincing
09:25:40 17 evidence that an asserted claim was anticipated by the
09:25:43 18 prior art.

09:25:46 19 If you find that the Defendant has proven by clear
09:25:48 20 and convincing evidence that asserted -- that an asserted
09:25:51 21 claim was anticipated by the prior art, as I've explained
09:25:55 22 the law to you, you must find that the asserted claim is
09:26:01 23 invalid.

09:26:02 24 If you find that the Defendant has failed to prove
09:26:04 25 by clear and convincing evidence that an asserted claim was

09:26:08 1 anticipated by any prior art, you must find the asserted
09:26:13 2 claim is not anticipated.

09:26:16 3 In determining whether or not the invention of an
09:26:19 4 asserted claim is invalid, you must determine the scope and
09:26:23 5 content of the prior art at the time the invention was
09:26:27 6 made.

09:26:30 7 For prior art to anticipate a claim of a patent,
09:26:32 8 the disclosure in the prior art reference does not have to
09:26:35 9 be in the same words as the claim, but all of the elements
09:26:40 10 of the claim must be there, either stated or necessarily
09:26:43 11 implied, so that someone of ordinary skill in the field of
09:26:47 12 the invention looking at that reference would be able to
09:26:50 13 make and use at least one embodiment of the claimed
09:26:54 14 invention.

09:26:54 15 Anticipation can occur when the claimed invention
09:27:03 16 inherently and necessarily results from practice of what
09:27:09 17 was disclosed in the written reference, even if the
09:27:13 18 inherent disclosure was unrecognized or unappreciated by
09:27:21 19 one of ordinary skill in the field of the invention.

09:27:26 20 If you find that -- if you find that an asserted
09:27:29 21 claim is not new, as I have explained it to you, you should
09:27:32 22 find that it is invalid.

09:27:34 23 Now, ladies and gentlemen, several times in my
09:27:36 24 instructions, I have referred to a person of ordinary skill
09:27:39 25 in the field of the invention. It's up to you to decide

09:27:42 1 the level of ordinary skill in the field of the invention.

09:27:45 2 In deciding what the level of ordinary skill is,
09:27:47 3 you should consider all the evidence introduced at the
09:27:50 4 trial, including:

09:27:53 5 (1) the levels of education and experience of
09:27:57 6 inventors and other persons working in the field;

09:27:59 7 (2) the types of problems encountered in the
09:28:03 8 field;

09:28:03 9 (3) prior art solutions to those problems;

09:28:06 10 (4) the rapidity with which innovations are made;

09:28:15 11 And, (5), the sophistication of the technology.

09:28:18 12 A person of ordinary skill in the art is a
09:28:22 13 hypothetical person who is presumed to be aware of all the
09:28:26 14 relevant prior art at the time of the claimed invention.

09:28:29 15 If you find that USAA has proven that Wells Fargo
09:28:35 16 has infringed any of the asserted claims and if you find
09:28:41 17 that Wells Fargo has failed to show that the asserted
09:28:43 18 claims are invalid, you must then consider the proper
09:28:47 19 amount of damages, if any, to award to USAA.

09:28:51 20 I will now instruct you about the measure of
09:28:59 21 damages. However, by instructing you on damages, I'm not
09:29:02 22 suggesting which party should win this case on any issue.

09:29:05 23 If you find that Wells Fargo has not infringed any
09:29:07 24 of the asserted claims or that the infringed claims are
09:29:11 25 invalid, then USAA is not entitled to any damages.

09:29:15 1 If you award damages, ladies and gentlemen, they
09:29:19 2 must be adequate to compensate USAA for any infringement of
09:29:24 3 the asserted claims you may find.

09:29:25 4 You must not award USAA damages -- I'm sorry, you
09:29:37 5 must not award USAA more -- USAA more damages than are
09:29:41 6 adequate to compensate for the infringement, nor should you
09:29:45 7 include any additional amount for the purpose of --
09:29:48 8 purposes of punishing Wells Fargo.

09:29:52 9 The patent law specifically provide that damages
09:29:55 10 for infringement may not be less than a reasonable royalty.

09:30:00 11 Now, USAA has the burden to establish the amount
09:30:03 12 of its damages by a preponderance of the evidence. In
09:30:07 13 other words, you should award only those damages that USAA
09:30:11 14 establishes that it more likely than not suffered as a
09:30:16 15 result of Wells Fargo's infringement of the asserted
09:30:19 16 claims.

09:30:22 17 While USAA is not required to prove the amount of
09:30:26 18 its damages with mathematical precision, it must prove them
09:30:30 19 with reasonable certainty. USAA is not entitled to damages
09:30:35 20 that are remote or speculative.

09:30:37 21 A reasonable royalty is the amount of royalty
09:30:42 22 payment that a patentholder and the alleged infringer would
09:30:46 23 have agreed to in a hypothetical negotiation taking place
09:30:50 24 at a time immediately prior to when the infringement first
09:30:53 25 began.

09:30:54 1 In considering this hypothetical negotiation, you
09:30:57 2 should focus on what the expectations of the patentholder
09:31:05 3 and the alleged infringer would have been had they entered
09:31:08 4 into an agreement at that time and had they acted
09:31:10 5 reasonably in their negotiations.

09:31:12 6 In determining this, you must assume that both
09:31:16 7 parties believe the asserted patents were valid and
09:31:21 8 infringed and that both parties were willing to enter into
09:31:25 9 an agreement.

09:31:26 10 The reasonable royalty you determine must be a
09:31:28 11 royalty that would have resulted from the hypothetical
09:31:32 12 negotiation and not simply a royalty that either party
09:31:35 13 would have preferred.

09:31:36 14 The law requires that any damages awarded to USAA
09:31:40 15 correspond to the value of the alleged inventions within
09:31:44 16 the accused product, as distinct from other unpatented
09:31:50 17 features of the accused product or other factors, such as
09:31:54 18 advertising or marketing, or Wells Fargo's size or
09:31:58 19 market -- market position.

09:32:01 20 This is particularly true where the accused
09:32:04 21 product has multiple features and multiple components not
09:32:08 22 covered by the patent or where the accused product works in
09:32:14 23 conjunction with other non-patented items.

09:32:17 24 Therefore, ladies and gentlemen, the amount you
09:32:18 25 find as damages must be on the value attributable to the

09:32:23 1 patented technology alone.

09:32:24 2 Now, in determining a reasonable royalty, you
09:32:27 3 should consider all the facts known and available to the
09:32:30 4 parties at the time infringement began. You may also
09:32:35 5 consider the following:

09:32:36 6 (1) the royalties received by the patentee for
09:32:40 7 licensing of the patent-in-suit, proving or tending to
09:32:43 8 prove an established royalty;

09:32:44 9 (2) the rates paid by the licensee for the use of
09:32:49 10 other patents comparable to the patent-in-suit;

09:32:52 11 (3) the nature and scope of the license, as
09:32:56 12 exclusive or non-exclusive, or as restricted or
09:32:59 13 non-restricted in terms of territory, or with respect to
09:33:03 14 whom the manufactured product may be sold;

09:33:05 15 (4) the licensor's established policy and
09:33:10 16 marketing program to maintain its patent monopoly by not
09:33:15 17 licensing others to use the invention or by granting
09:33:18 18 licenses under special conditions designed to preserve that
09:33:23 19 monopoly;

09:33:23 20 (5) the commercial relationship between the
09:33:26 21 licensor and licensee, such as whether they are competitors
09:33:30 22 in the same territory in the same lines of business or
09:33:35 23 whether they are inventor and promoter;

09:33:37 24 (6) the effect of selling the patented specialty
09:33:41 25 in promoting sales of other products of the licensee, that

09:33:46 1 existing value of the invention or the licensor as a
09:33:51 2 generator of sales of its non-patented items and the extent
09:33:54 3 of such derivative or convoyed sales;

09:33:57 4 (7) the duration of the patent and the term of the
09:34:01 5 license;

09:34:02 6 (8) the established profitability of a product
09:34:09 7 made under the patent, its commercial success, and its
09:34:12 8 current popularity;

09:34:13 9 (9) the utility and advantages of the patent
09:34:17 10 property over the old modes or devices, if any, that had
09:34:23 11 been used for working out similar results.

09:34:25 12 (10) the nature of the patented invention, the
09:34:28 13 character of the commercial embodiment of it as owned and
09:34:32 14 produced by the licensor, and the benefits to those who
09:34:35 15 have used the invention;

09:34:36 16 (11) the extent to which the infringer has made
09:34:40 17 use of the invention and any evidence probative of the
09:34:43 18 value of that use;

09:34:44 19 (12) the portion of the profit or of the selling
09:34:50 20 price that may be customary in the particular business or
09:34:53 21 in comparable businesses to allow for the use of the
09:34:56 22 invention or analogous inventions;

09:34:58 23 (13) the portion of the realizable profit that
09:35:03 24 should be credited to the invention as distinguished from
09:35:06 25 non-patented elements, the manufacturing process, business

09:35:10 1 risks, or significant features or improvements added by the
09:35:16 2 infringer;

09:35:17 3 (14) the opinion testimony of qualified experts;

09:35:20 4 (15) the amount that a licensor, such as USAA, and
09:35:27 5 a licensee, such as Wells Fargo, would have agreed upon at
09:35:32 6 the time the infringement began if both had been reasonably
09:35:35 7 and voluntarily trying to reach an agreement -- that is,
09:35:39 8 the amount which a prudent licensee, who desired as a
09:35:44 9 business proposition to obtain a license to manufacture and
09:35:50 10 sell a particular article embodying the patented invention,
09:35:53 11 would have been willing to pay as a royalty and yet be able
09:35:56 12 to make a reasonable profit and which amount would have
09:35:59 13 been acceptable by a prudent patentee who was willing to
09:36:03 14 grant a license.

09:36:04 15 No one of these factors is dispositive, ladies and
09:36:09 16 gentlemen, and you can and should consider all the evidence
09:36:12 17 that's been presented to you in this case on each of these
09:36:15 18 factors.

09:36:18 19 You may also consider other factors which in your
09:36:21 20 minds would have increased or decreased the royalty
09:36:25 21 Wells Fargo would have been willing to pay and the patent
09:36:29 22 owner, USAA, would have been willing to accept, both acting
09:36:32 23 as normally prudent business people.

09:36:34 24 In determining a reasonable royalty, you may also
09:36:40 25 consider evidence concerning the availability or lack

09:36:43 1 thereof of non-infringing alternatives to the patented
09:36:47 2 invention.

09:36:48 3 You may compare the patented invention to
09:36:51 4 non-infringing alternatives to determine the value of the
09:36:54 5 patented invention, including the utility and advantages of
09:37:00 6 the patent over the old modes or devices, if any, that had
09:37:04 7 been used to achieve similar results.

09:37:06 8 As I've already told you, you must not award
09:37:11 9 USAA -- USAA any additional amount for the purpose of --
09:37:15 10 purposes of punishing Wells Fargo or setting an example.

09:37:19 11 Additionally, you must not consider USAA's
09:37:22 12 allegations of willfulness in considering damages.
09:37:27 13 Consideration of willfulness is entirely separate from the
09:37:30 14 question of damages. You may not increase damages because
09:37:35 15 you find willfulness or decrease damages because you did
09:37:38 16 not find willfulness.

09:37:40 17 I will take your decision regarding the issue of
09:37:43 18 willfulness into account later.

09:37:45 19 Now, with these instructions, ladies and
09:37:48 20 gentlemen, we will now at this time proceed to hear closing
09:37:52 21 arguments from the attorneys for the parties.

09:37:55 22 Plaintiff, you may now present your first closing
09:37:58 23 argument.

09:37:59 24 MR. BUNT: Thank you, Your Honor.

09:38:00 25 May it please the Court.

09:38:08 1 THE COURT: You may proceed.

09:38:09 2 MR. BUNT: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

09:38:14 3 I want to begin by thanking you for your service
09:38:18 4 today. I know that many of you have driven from different
09:38:22 5 towns every day here. I know that your time here has taken
09:38:26 6 you away from your family and from your jobs.

09:38:30 7 I know that both sides have presented a lot of
09:38:34 8 information to you in a very rapid fashion, and it may have
09:38:38 9 felt like you were at times drinking from a fire hose.

09:38:42 10 And on behalf of USAA and the entire legal team, I
09:38:44 11 would just like to say thank you for your time and for your
09:38:47 12 attention.

09:38:47 13 Now, Wells Fargo said something in their opening
09:38:51 14 statement that resonated with me.

09:38:55 15 Ms. Williams said that this case is about respect,
09:38:59 16 and I think that makes a lot of sense. And, in fact, I
09:39:02 17 wrote down what she said. She said: I want to talk with
09:39:05 18 you about respect for property rights, respect for the
09:39:08 19 process, and respect for the value of those specific
09:39:13 20 property rights.

09:39:15 21 Judge Gilstrap just gave you instructions, and one
09:39:17 22 of those instructions that you heard is that you are the
09:39:20 23 sole judges of the credibility and believability of the
09:39:24 24 witnesses and the evidence. And I want to ask that you
09:39:28 25 consider the credibility of the evidence, especially in

09:39:32 1 light of the issue of respect.

09:39:35 2 I want to talk first about respect for USAA's
09:39:42 3 property.

09:39:43 4 USAA began the research on remote deposit capture
09:39:49 5 back in 2004, and USAA launched Deposit@Home product in
09:39:56 6 2006. You'll recall that that's the product that allowed
09:39:59 7 members to use everyday scanners and digital cameras to
09:40:02 8 deposit their checks remotely.

09:40:05 9 And USAA filed its patent applications in 2006 for
09:40:11 10 the parents of the '605 and '681. And USAA released its
09:40:18 11 MRDC phone app in 2009, the first bank to do that.

09:40:23 12 And in 2011, the parent application for the '605
09:40:28 13 and the '681, those patent applications began to be
09:40:30 14 published.

09:40:31 15 Then we look to 2012. Three years after USAA came
09:40:37 16 out with its first product is when Wells Fargo finally
09:40:40 17 launched its MRDC app.

09:40:43 18 Now, what did you hear in opening statements,
09:40:46 19 though, about this? You heard them say that the patent was
09:40:49 20 invalid. Look at the testimony at the bottom of this slide
09:40:52 21 from Mr. -- Mr. Saffici, who said: You can't -- he was
09:40:56 22 asked: You can't identify any system, any design anywhere
09:41:00 23 in the world that anticipates or renders obvious the '605
09:41:05 24 or '681 patent, correct?

09:41:06 25 And he said: That was my testimony then and now.

09:41:10 1 Nobody else was before USAA. Ask yourself what
09:41:18 2 does Wells Fargo's contention about invalidity say to you
09:41:23 3 about their respect for USAA's property rights?

09:41:26 4 You also heard in the opening statement that the
09:41:33 5 Patent Office gave no express indication that they had
09:41:37 6 looked at the 2006 specifications to confirm whether mobile
09:41:41 7 phones were described during that one-year process.

09:41:44 8 But what did you hear in evidence?

09:41:46 9 Mr. Saffici was asked: You understand that Patent
09:41:50 10 Office examiners are required to read the specification to
09:41:52 11 determine if there is support in a specification for the
09:41:56 12 claims as a part of the examination process?

09:42:00 13 And he said: Yes, I would agree.

09:42:02 14 He was also asked: The Patent Office in the '605
09:42:06 15 process -- prosecution record considered the question of
09:42:09 16 priority, correct?

09:42:10 17 His answer was: Yes.

09:42:12 18 The examiner looked at the patent and agreed that
09:42:16 19 it was entitled to a priority date of 2006 because it was
09:42:22 20 supported by that specification.

09:42:24 21 What else did we hear?

09:42:26 22 Well, you heard in the opening statement that the
09:42:31 23 2018 patents for the first time talk about using a mobile
09:42:35 24 device with a digital camera for check deposit. That's
09:42:38 25 what Wells Fargo told you.

09:42:39 1 Evidence you heard, though, was that Mr. Saffici
09:42:45 2 was asked: The specifications of the patents in this case
09:42:49 3 disclose the use of mobile devices with digital cameras,
09:42:53 4 correct?

09:42:53 5 And he said: That is what I testified to.

09:42:56 6 That was disclosed in 2006 by the original
09:43:00 7 specification, the exact opposite of Wells Fargo's opening
09:43:03 8 statement.

09:43:04 9 Now, there was some suggestion that -- that
09:43:11 10 Mr. Saffici was somehow confused about this issue or that
09:43:14 11 he didn't know exactly what had been said in the
09:43:17 12 deposition. Mr. Saffici gave two days' worth of
09:43:21 13 depositions. Both sides were there. Both sides were
09:43:24 14 allowed to question him. Both sides were allowed to
09:43:27 15 redirect questions just like you've heard here in the
09:43:29 16 Court. Mr. Saffici had a chance to look at that deposition
09:43:32 17 after it was taken back at his office and to see if any
09:43:36 18 mistakes were made.

09:43:38 19 Wells Fargo just doesn't like this testimony. But
09:43:40 20 that is the testimony that was given.

09:43:42 21 You also heard from Mr. Brady who told you that
09:43:47 22 the patent rules changed back in 2016, and he said: USAA
09:43:53 23 went back and refiled its patents to make sure it complied
09:43:57 24 with the new standards.

09:43:58 25 What does that tell you about who has respect for

09:44:01 1 the patent process?

09:44:02 2 I expect Wells Fargo may say to you throughout
09:44:07 3 this process that we should have brought Mr. Calman here to
09:44:12 4 testify. I want you to remember that Wells Fargo is the
09:44:15 5 party who has the burden of proof on invalidity. And it's
09:44:20 6 a clear and convincing standard of proof.

09:44:21 7 You heard testimony that Mr. Calman had prepared
09:44:26 8 an expert report and that he and Dr. Conte worked together
09:44:30 9 on those -- on preparing those reports. And Dr. -- or
09:44:36 10 Mr. Calman described the specification to Dr. Conte.

09:44:39 11 And you'll recall Dr. Conte discussing the Palm
09:44:44 12 Treo that existed back in 2006. And you'll recall that
09:44:48 13 Mr. Calman had told him that by 2006, the Windows operating
09:44:52 14 system included Windows mobile phone operating system for
09:45:00 15 use with mobile phones.

09:45:02 16 Dr. Conte testified that he agreed with
09:45:05 17 Mr. Calman. There was no reason to bring additional
09:45:06 18 witnesses when all the evidence was already here.

09:45:11 19 You just heard from the Court that a single
09:45:14 20 witness -- a single witness is sufficient to prove -- you
09:45:17 21 don't have to bring multiple witnesses. That would have
09:45:20 22 been a waste of time for the Court and for you.

09:45:23 23 THE COURT: Seven minutes have been used.

09:45:25 24 MR. BUNT: Thank you, Your Honor.

09:45:27 25 If Wells Fargo thought that Mr. Calman would have

09:45:29 1 said something different here at trial, then they could
09:45:32 2 easily have called him to testify at trial themselves.

09:45:36 3 One more comment about Mr. Saffici. Mr. Saffici
09:45:39 4 was not hired -- well, let me say this: Wells Fargo hired
09:45:44 5 as an invalidity expert a person who did not have technical
09:45:54 6 expertise. He had no role in actually designing a mobile
09:45:55 7 capture system. And it was not fair to put Mr. Saffici in
09:45:57 8 that role.

09:45:59 9 And it's even more unfair when you consider what
09:46:01 10 his expertise is in. He's highly experienced in business.
09:46:06 11 He has 53 years of banking experience, and he could have
09:46:11 12 easily talked about the value of MRDC and what the value of
09:46:17 13 that technology is in the marketplace. But Wells Fargo did
09:46:19 14 not call him for that.

09:46:20 15 Ladies and gentlemen, this case is about
09:46:25 16 infringement, validity, and damages. And despite what the
09:46:28 17 documents say and what their own witnesses said at the
09:46:31 18 deposition, they have trotted out a litany of excuses at
09:46:35 19 this trial.

09:46:37 20 Think about what they are saying. It is basically
09:46:40 21 like if somebody stole your lawn mower and you accuse them
09:46:44 22 of it, and they said, oh, no, I didn't take that, but even
09:46:47 23 if I did, it was broken at the time, and even if it wasn't
09:46:52 24 broken, it really wasn't worth that much to me.

09:46:57 25 That doesn't make any sense. All of this

09:47:00 1 indicates Wells Fargo's lack of respect for property
09:47:03 2 rights, their lack of respect for the process, their lack
09:47:07 3 of respect for the value of property rights.

09:47:10 4 I respectfully request that you consider these
09:47:10 5 facts when you retire to the jury room to deliberate.

09:47:18 6 Thank you so much for your time and your
09:47:21 7 attention.

09:47:21 8 MR. SHEASBY: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen
09:47:26 9 of the jury. I would also like to thank you for your time
09:47:30 10 this last week.

09:47:31 11 I want to start out by talking about the story
09:47:38 12 that led to where we are today, and it's a story that
09:47:41 13 begins with Chuck Oakes, the head of the Applied Research
09:47:45 14 Division at USAA, who is now retired -- he has over a
09:47:49 15 hundred patents to his name -- who believes that the system
09:47:52 16 that USAA created would transform the banking industry.

09:47:55 17 And we see from Wells Fargo's own internal records
09:47:59 18 that he was right, that the MRDC system that USAA created
09:48:03 19 was recognized as table stakes, as absolutely essential to
09:48:08 20 the industry.

09:48:09 21 And what's powerful about USAA's system is its
09:48:15 22 durability. A system was created in 2006, that as
09:48:22 23 Mr. Brady testified, to this day can host and support any
09:48:27 24 digital device that has a camera and a general purpose
09:48:31 25 processor. USAA can meet its members wherever they are

09:48:34 1 over the years.

09:48:35 2 And you think about, by building that foundation,
09:48:38 3 it answers the question: Why did the United States Patent
09:48:42 4 Office give us a foundational patent on MRDC? Because of
09:48:47 5 the powerful foundation the applied engineering division at
09:48:50 6 USAA had created.

09:48:50 7 Four questions. The first one is infringement.
09:48:57 8 No intent required. No acts -- it doesn't matter if it was
09:49:00 9 an accident. It doesn't matter if you did it on purpose.
09:49:03 10 It's strict liability.

09:49:04 11 The burden is ours. The burden is preponderance
09:49:07 12 of the evidence. If one pebble tips in favor of USAA on
09:49:12 13 infringement, as a matter of law, USAA must prevail.

09:49:17 14 Professor Conte spent time and walked you through
09:49:21 15 each limitation of each claim of the patent. He reviewed
09:49:25 16 source code with you. He looked and mapped every single
09:49:29 17 limitation.

09:49:30 18 Now, what is remarkable about that is that when
09:49:34 19 Wells Fargo's expert took the stand -- there are two
09:49:38 20 patents in the case. There's the '605 patent. And Wells
09:49:44 21 Fargo's own expert admitted that he has no technical
09:49:48 22 defense whatsoever to the infringement of the '605, none at
09:49:53 23 all. Nothing.

09:49:55 24 As to the '681 patent, he said, oh, well, the
09:50:00 25 mobile device has to perform the OCR and optical character

09:50:03 1 recognition. But if you remember, he showed you a claim
09:50:08 2 that expressly says that the system performs the OCR
09:50:11 3 system. But he didn't highlight the word "system." He
09:50:17 4 didn't highlight the word "system."

09:50:18 5 And when I cross-examined him, he admitted that
09:50:21 6 the system includes both the back end and front end
09:50:24 7 processors.

09:50:25 8 Now, what Wells Fargo did say is they say, oh,
09:50:29 9 it's not our fault. We don't make the system. That's our
09:50:33 10 customer's problem.

09:50:35 11 But when I asked Dr. Villasenor on
09:50:39 12 cross-examination, he admitted that when he told you all
09:50:44 13 the claims were system claims, that was not true. There's
09:50:49 14 a claim to a mobile application.

09:50:50 15 So even if you accepted his argument, the argument
09:50:54 16 would fail because here we have a claim to the application,
09:50:58 17 which Dr. Villasenor admits Wells Fargo's made -- makes.

09:51:02 18 Now I want to turn to willful infringement.
09:51:06 19 Willful infringement is about intent. And there's a couple
09:51:10 20 of interesting categories of evidence that have been
09:51:15 21 created -- that have been discovered during this case.

09:51:18 22 The first is that Wells Fargo has known about our
09:51:19 23 patent application since 2010. They knew about the MRDC
09:51:23 24 patent applications since 2010. Their corporate
09:51:30 25 representative -- representative had to admit it. If --

09:51:32 1 remember, he first denied it. And then Ms. Glasser had to
09:51:36 2 show him his testimony under oath. And at that point, he
09:51:39 3 was forced to admit it.

09:51:42 4 And what's more, the folks who actually designed
09:51:47 5 Wells Fargo's MRDC system, like Mr. Ajami, admitted that
09:51:52 6 they were copying USAA's system.

09:51:54 7 Now, here's an important point. If we hadn't
09:51:59 8 created something foundational, if our patent was invalid,
09:52:04 9 if we're just -- have worthless technology, why were they
09:52:10 10 looking at our applications in 2010, four years after they
09:52:13 11 were filed? Why were they leveraging our design to create
09:52:17 12 our design?

09:52:18 13 The idea that our patents are invalid, the idea
09:52:21 14 that our patents don't cover MRDC, the idea that our
09:52:24 15 patents aren't foundational, has no connection to common
09:52:31 16 sense.

09:52:33 17 And as the Judge told you, one of the most
09:52:36 18 powerful tools you have is common sense. Why would a bank
09:52:39 19 that has more branches and more tellers than any other bank
09:52:42 20 in the United States be looking at our patent applications
09:52:45 21 and be, quote, leveraging our design if we hadn't created
09:52:49 22 something foundational?

09:52:51 23 The third question: Are USAA's patents valid?

09:52:58 24 Validity is a completely different standard.

09:53:05 25 Validity requires clear and convincing evidence, and the

09:53:10 1 reason it requires clear and convincing evidence is because
09:53:14 2 the patents were carefully examined by independent third
09:53:19 3 parties, the Patent Office.

09:53:20 4 And so whereas the preponderance of the evidence
09:53:24 5 standard requires just one pebble to weigh in favor of
09:53:30 6 USAA, the clear and convincing standard requires much
09:53:34 7 greater weight of evidence for Wells Fargo.

09:53:37 8 And you'll see it in the Judge's instructions. On
09:53:43 9 Page 14 of the Judge's instructions, the presumption of
09:53:45 10 validity exists.

09:53:47 11 The instructions also make clear that it is Wells
09:53:51 12 Fargo's sole burden to prove by clear and convincing
09:53:53 13 evidence that the patent is invalid. Their sole burden.

09:54:00 14 The instructions also make clear that as few as
09:54:05 15 one example can be sufficient for written description of a
09:54:08 16 larger category.

09:54:09 17 When you create a foundational invention, you
09:54:12 18 can't just take a new type of digital device that comes out
09:54:15 19 next year and say, oh, well, then we don't have to do
09:54:19 20 anything to take responsibility for our actions because now
09:54:22 21 we purchased the new iPhone. But that doesn't make sense
09:54:26 22 when you have a foundational invention.

09:54:28 23 The United States Patent Office considered the
09:54:35 24 exact question presented to the jury. Are the claims
09:54:41 25 described in the specification? And Mr. Saffici was --

09:54:45 1 admitted under oath that the prosecution record makes clear
09:54:49 2 that the question of priority was considered by the
09:54:52 3 examiner in the '605 patent, and he admitted that the
09:54:55 4 question of priority was considered in the '681 patent, and
09:55:00 5 the patents were granted.

09:55:01 6 Now, the record, I believe, showed at trial that
09:55:07 7 the patent examiners got it right. The claims have no
09:55:13 8 connection to how a digital camera and a general purpose
09:55:16 9 computer are connected. It's irrelevant how they're
09:55:20 10 connected because the power of the claims is the use of a
09:55:22 11 software application that could control those systems to
09:55:27 12 create something powerful.

09:55:30 13 The inside of a patent is the software, and you
09:55:33 14 heard Mr. Brady talk about that in his testimony. A
09:55:38 15 digital camera, a portable device to control the digital
09:55:42 16 camera with software.

09:55:42 17 Professor Conte spoke about the fact the patent
09:55:51 18 doesn't care about how many boxes you put the devices in.
09:55:54 19 What the patent cares about is the software.

09:55:57 20 And if you remember, he talked about cracking open
09:56:00 21 his iPhone, and if he cracked open his iPhone, he'd see in
09:56:03 22 that iPhone a camera connected to a general purpose
09:56:09 23 processor.

09:56:11 24 That's what's in an iPhone. That's what's in a
09:56:15 25 tablet. That's what's in every digital device with a

09:56:19 1 camera and that can run an app today.

09:56:21 2 Mr. Saffici was asked bluntly, the claims of the
09:56:28 3 patents just require the presence of a digital camera in a
09:56:31 4 portable or mobile device. Integrated versus
09:56:35 5 non-integrated, two boxes versus three boxes versus four
09:56:38 6 boxes. It's irrelevant to the patent claims, and it's
09:56:41 7 irrelevant to the patent because USAA created the
09:56:46 8 foundation, because it takes its members where they were.

09:56:50 9 And what did Mr. Saffici say, under oath: You
09:56:53 10 said that the specification teaches that the handheld
09:56:55 11 device may include a digital camera?

09:56:56 12 I did say that.

09:56:58 13 He didn't just say it in his deposition. He
09:57:02 14 didn't just say it at trial. He said it in his actual
09:57:06 15 expert report.

09:57:10 16 They claim that this patent doesn't disclose a
09:57:13 17 handheld device that may include a digital camera. That is
09:57:15 18 the essence of what they spent the last four days trying to
09:57:20 19 convince you of.

09:57:21 20 And Mr. Saffici in his report and under oath in
09:57:23 21 front of you said the exact opposite. That is the
09:57:29 22 testimony in the record. Mr. Saffici wasn't confused.
09:57:33 23 Mr. Saffici told the truth when he was faced with the facts
09:57:38 24 of what was in front of him.

09:57:40 25 Mr. Saffici admitted, without qualification, that

09:57:46 1 every single limitation, mobile device, digital camera,
09:57:50 2 communication together is described in that common 2006
09:57:54 3 specification. Mr. Saffici wasn't confused. This is what
09:57:59 4 he admitted to under oath.

09:58:02 5 Mr. Saffici was actually shown lines of the
09:58:06 6 patent. He was shown the passages from both the '605 and
09:58:14 7 '681 patent that talk about communicatively coupling.

09:58:15 8 THE COURT: 20 minutes have been used.

09:58:17 9 MR. SHEASBY: And what he said -- what he said was
09:58:23 10 that, I don't see any limitation in the specification, any
09:58:30 11 limitation whatsoever as to how that communicatively
09:58:34 12 coupling occurs. It can be in separate boxes. It can be
09:58:38 13 in one box. It was irrelevant to Mr. Saffici.

09:58:41 14 There is a place in this world for great
09:58:56 15 innovations. The Applied Research Division at USAA was one
09:59:04 16 of those places. The members' money that was used to
09:59:12 17 create these -- these -- these innovations deserves to be
09:59:16 18 respected.

09:59:18 19 And one of the most important aspects of respect
09:59:21 20 is respect of the labor of our members and the hard-earned
09:59:27 21 funds of our members that created these innovations.

09:59:32 22 The last question you're asked to be -- decide is
09:59:40 23 damages, and Mr. Weinstein has concluded that damages of no
09:59:44 24 less than 85 cents per successful deposit should be
09:59:48 25 awarded. And that's \$102 million during the damages

09:59:53 1 period.

09:59:54 2 And one of the things that's most striking about
09:59:58 3 the examination of Mr. Gerardi yesterday, at the end of the
10:00:02 4 day, was he gave you a number, \$3.9 million. He didn't
10:00:07 5 even bother to tell you what that was on a per unit basis,
10:00:11 6 and the reason for that is because it's pennies.

10:00:14 7 Wells Fargo charges USAA members \$3.50 every time
10:00:19 8 we go to their ATMs, and we pay it. And we pay it because
10:00:22 9 they invested their money in it, and they have a right to
10:00:26 10 that return.

10:00:27 11 Wells Fargo, through EWS, charges us 60 cents
10:00:32 12 every time we use their -- their Zelle system. And USAA
10:00:35 13 pays it. And we pay it because what they invested in.

10:00:40 14 And yet when we come to them and ask them to pay
10:00:44 15 fair value for a technology that their internal records
10:00:48 16 admit is table stakes, for a technology that their internal
10:00:51 17 records show they copied from us, they tell us, you get
10:00:55 18 three cents.

10:00:58 19 Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I will have one
10:01:00 20 more opportunity to speak with you. Thank you for your
10:01:02 21 time.

10:01:04 22 THE COURT: Defendant may now present its closing
10:01:11 23 argument.

10:01:14 24 MR. MELSHEIMER: May I have a moment, Your Honor?

10:01:20 25 THE COURT: Proceed when you're ready.

10:01:22 1 MR. MELSHEIMER: May it please the Court.

10:01:32 2 Good morning. We promised you respect. I hope
10:01:39 3 you think we've delivered it over the last few days. We
10:01:44 4 respect you, we respect your time, and we appreciate the
10:01:48 5 sacrifice it has been for you to come to court every day
10:01:53 6 and listen to the testimony and see the evidence.

10:01:55 7 You are vitally important to this process because
10:02:00 8 without you -- without you leaving your homes every day and
10:02:03 9 leaving your jobs, someone can come into court and claim
10:02:08 10 that a patent they filed in 2017 was actually invented in
10:02:14 11 2006. Someone can come to court and claim that a patent is
10:02:19 12 being infringed even when not all the elements are
10:02:25 13 satisfied.

10:02:26 14 Without you, someone can come to court and claim
10:02:30 15 credit and seek money for things they did not invent. And
10:02:35 16 that is why you are so important. That is why your role is
10:02:39 17 so important, and that is why we have so much respect for
10:02:42 18 you.

10:02:42 19 At the beginning of the trial, you heard that when
10:02:46 20 you're accused of patent infringement, you only have two
10:02:48 21 choices, vacate or seek permission.

10:02:52 22 Well, you now know that's not true, because it's
10:02:57 23 appropriate and proper for someone to come into court who's
10:03:01 24 been accused of things that are wrong or exaggerated or
10:03:06 25 overstated, to challenge the patent in court, to deny

10:03:08 1 infringement, to claim the patent's invalid and prove it,
10:03:13 2 and also to say, you know what, the valuation you've put on
10:03:16 3 your innovation, if you have one, is far exaggerated and
10:03:19 4 far in excess of reality.

10:03:21 5 That's what you're here to help us with.

10:03:26 6 With all that in mind, Ms. Williams and I decided
10:03:31 7 to divide our time this way: I'm going to go through with
10:03:35 8 you the evidence -- some of the evidence in the next 20
10:03:37 9 minutes or so. And she's going to show you how that
10:03:40 10 evidence links up with the instructions that the Court just
10:03:45 11 gave you about how this case should be decided. And I hope
10:03:48 12 that you will find that approach helpful.

10:03:51 13 The first witness in the case was Mr. Chuck Oakes.
10:03:55 14 Now, he was an inventor of the case. And he invented
10:03:58 15 something -- he admitted something important, that USAA did
10:04:00 16 not invent check imaging.

10:04:03 17 He also admitted that back in 2006 their focus
10:04:10 18 wasn't on what they're claiming now. Their focus was on
10:04:13 19 using a scanner, a separate scanner used to get checks or
10:04:17 20 documents into the system.

10:04:17 21 Before October 2006 when this patent claim claims
10:04:25 22 to have been invented, USAA had not done any work on the
10:04:28 23 processing and image of a check taken with a mobile phone,
10:04:33 24 correct?

10:04:33 25 The only thing they had done was with a webcam

10:04:36 1 which is a separate device that's attached to the computer.

10:04:38 2 They brought you Mr. Brady, their corporate
10:04:42 3 representative. Not an inventor on these patents, not
10:04:44 4 someone that contributed to the technology that they say
10:04:47 5 they're so proud of. But he did admit some important
10:04:50 6 things.

10:04:51 7 He admitted that USAA should not recover value or
10:04:54 8 money for things they didn't invent. If they didn't invent
10:04:57 9 something, they shouldn't ask other people to pay for it.

10:05:01 10 He also admitted that USAA did not start
10:05:04 11 experimenting with digital phones or camera phones until
10:05:10 12 2007. If their specification had described that fully to
10:05:13 13 support their invention, which they claim to have invented,
10:05:17 14 that wouldn't have been true.

10:05:18 15 The next witness you heard from was Dr. Conte.
10:05:24 16 Remember, the only step that we're focused on for
10:05:29 17 infringement -- because, remember, the Judge just told you,
10:05:32 18 if one's missing, there's no infringement. These patents
10:05:35 19 claim multiple steps. If there's one missing, there's no
10:05:39 20 infringement.

10:05:39 21 This is that confirming step, causing the
10:05:42 22 customer's mobile device to perform the confirming.

10:05:45 23 And we asked Dr. Conte: The only device that is
10:05:50 24 deciding whether or not the check deposit can go forward is
10:05:53 25 the server?

10:05:54 1 That's correct.

10:05:57 2 The decision, yes.

10:05:59 3 In the Wells Fargo product, comparing the
10:06:01 4 OCR-determined amount to the amount indicated by the user
10:06:04 5 is not performed on the portable device?

10:06:06 6 What he's admitting there is that there's no
10:06:10 7 infringement because one element is missing.

10:06:13 8 Now, he wants to play word games about deciding
10:06:17 9 versus validating, but it's confirming. And the work to
10:06:20 10 confirm occurs not on your phone but on the servers that
10:06:25 11 are way back in Wells Fargo's system.

10:06:27 12 There was a suggestion that somehow this patent
10:06:31 13 specification was like a word search game where we could
10:06:35 14 simply look for terms and say, well, here's a PDA, and,
10:06:38 15 therefore, that means we really invented these 2017 claims
10:06:44 16 way back in 2006.

10:06:45 17 But even Dr. Conte has to admit that PDAs only
10:06:48 18 appears twice in one of the specifications and appears not
10:06:51 19 at all in the '681.

10:06:53 20 He also never went through the claim elements of
10:06:58 21 the invention to describe how the bank was benefitted
10:07:02 22 versus how it benefitted the consumer. That's important
10:07:05 23 because the Judge just told you that to find infringement,
10:07:10 24 when you have multiple parties involved, you have to show
10:07:13 25 an element-by-element benefit. And that was not shown by

10:07:17 1 Dr. Conte or anyone else in this case.

10:07:19 2 He did not offer an opinion that the patents were
10:07:24 3 valid. This man, Mr. Calman, did that.

10:07:28 4 Now, you've heard a lot about him. He's not in
10:07:30 5 court today. He's never been in court. And the statement
10:07:33 6 was, well, we could have called him. Why would we call
10:07:38 7 him? He was their expert to supposedly do two things, to
10:07:41 8 rebut Mr. Saffici's conclusions and prove up that the
10:07:45 9 invention truly was described in the claims.

10:07:47 10 And, two, he was a man that had 20 more -- 20 or
10:07:52 11 more years in the banking industry, and he could have
10:07:54 12 talked about the benefits of the invention, the benefits
10:07:57 13 that Mr. Weinstein struggled mightily to identify for you
10:08:03 14 in the claims. But they didn't bring him to do that
10:08:06 15 either.

10:08:06 16 And it's fair to ask -- it's fair to ask: Why
10:08:09 17 didn't they? What would we -- what would he have said that
10:08:12 18 they were concerned about, especially with respect to the
10:08:15 19 alleged value of the claimed benefits of this invention?
10:08:20 20 What were they worried about him saying to you?

10:08:23 21 You heard from Mr. Easley. He had to acknowledge
10:08:26 22 that all these things they think are important about fraud
10:08:29 23 detection were, in fact, done either via the teller years
10:08:34 24 ago or through some back end processes at the time of the
10:08:39 25 asserted inventions.

10:08:40 1 They want to claim that all these things that they
10:08:42 2 say they invented in the patent provide all this great
10:08:46 3 value to mobile deposit, but they've been doing those
10:08:49 4 things for years.

10:08:50 5 All banks have been doing those things for years,
10:08:53 6 either at the teller -- when you give the check to the
10:08:56 7 teller and the person looks at it and says, okay, here's
10:08:59 8 your amount, does it match? That's what they're talking
10:09:02 9 about. That's what they're claiming to be the benefit or
10:09:05 10 value of their invention.

10:09:06 11 Next, you heard from Roy Weinstein, a capable man,
10:09:11 12 and he admitted some important things. First, there's no
10:09:14 13 one that's ever licensed these patents. The Judge tells
10:09:17 14 you that's a factor you can consider in valuing these
10:09:20 15 alleged inventions. They say they're groundbreaking. They
10:09:25 16 say they're like Apple or Google. No one's taken a license
10:09:32 17 to these inventions.

10:09:33 18 Also, explain to you how you value a patent. You
10:09:37 19 value the incremental contribution. You value what's new
10:09:40 20 about the patent, what's new about the patent that didn't
10:09:43 21 exist before.

10:09:43 22 Now, remember when Mr. Hill went over this flip
10:09:50 23 chart here, and Mr. Weinstein was on the stand. He says:
10:09:53 24 Okay. Mr. Weinstein, I will write down the new fraud
10:09:58 25 prevention features that appear in those claims that you're

10:10:01 1 valuing. I will write them down right here. There's
10:10:05 2 nothing there because he had to admit they're not in the
10:10:11 3 claims.

10:10:13 4 Something else peculiar happened with
10:10:18 5 Mr. Weinstein. He admitted that there was another damage
10:10:22 6 calculation that he kept private from you and the jury and
10:10:27 7 in court. He had done a different calculation of damages
10:10:32 8 that was \$40 million. And we asked him: Well, you didn't
10:10:36 9 show that one to the jury, did you?

10:10:38 10 Well, I wasn't asked to.

10:10:40 11 Do you believe it?

10:10:42 12 I absolutely believe in it.

10:10:46 13 You're entitled to consider why, in addition to
10:10:50 14 what Mr. Calman would have said, why didn't they present
10:10:53 15 this calculation to you? Isn't it kind of obvious? It's
10:10:57 16 much less and smaller than what they're claiming, but their
10:11:00 17 own expert said it was reliable.

10:11:03 18 Finally, Mr. Weinstein admitted what's happening
10:11:06 19 here is pretty common. Patents are often -- often
10:11:11 20 invalidated. Often. And he's worked on many cases where
10:11:15 21 that exact thing has happened.

10:11:17 22 So this notion that the presumption is important,
10:11:20 23 of course it is. The patent comes out of the Patent Office
10:11:23 24 presumed valid. But every day there are juries considering
10:11:29 25 issues just like this and finding that the patents are

10:11:30 1 invalid.

10:11:31 2 Our first witness was Mr. Al Hecht.

10:11:36 3 Now, Mr. Hecht testified for a couple of hours
10:11:38 4 about the Wells Fargo system, how it tries to claim the
10:11:43 5 value, and how Wells -- how USAA tries to talk about things
10:11:47 6 that they invented, when really they were things that were
10:11:53 7 in the Wells Fargo system for decades.

10:11:54 8 He talked about innovation, that Wells Fargo was
10:11:59 9 the first in Internet banking, was the first with remote
10:12:04 10 deposit capture, and the first with remote banking. This
10:12:06 11 is an innovative company. They don't have a monopoly on
10:12:09 12 ideas. This company -- this bank has also been innovative.
10:12:16 13 And you heard that, and it was uncontradicted.

10:12:19 14 He talked about -- and this is important -- that
10:12:21 15 checks can come in through hundreds of sources. And you
10:12:25 16 knew that. You knew that before you came into court. You
10:12:28 17 can deposit a check in an ATM. You can go to a teller and
10:12:32 18 deposit a check. A check can come in through direct
10:12:34 19 deposit. A check can be mailed in, all sorts of different
10:12:36 20 ways. And a check can come in through mobile deposit, of
10:12:39 21 course.

10:12:39 22 But he talked about and he showed you Exhibit 230.
10:12:42 23 You can ask for the exhibits. This is an important one.
10:12:45 24 Defendant's Exhibit 230, where he talks about everything on
10:12:48 25 the right there, the far right, that was a pre-existing

10:12:52 1 infrastructure. That was the work that Wells Fargo did to
10:12:56 2 process checks from whatever channel. That's not something
10:13:03 3 USAA should get paid for. That's not something they
10:13:05 4 created any value for.

10:13:06 5 And he told you that that information -- those
10:13:11 6 machines, that technology, that innovation had been in
10:13:18 7 place for decades. And there were no changes made to it
10:13:18 8 when they simply added another funnel. No changes made
10:13:21 9 after adding mobile deposit.

10:13:24 10 There was a suggestion made, and it was made again
10:13:28 11 by the Plaintiff, that somehow there was a focus on USAA,
10:13:33 12 that Wells Fargo was looking at USAA and no one else. But
10:13:36 13 you saw this document, 427. They tried to say it was only
10:13:40 14 about USAA. Well, it's actually about Chase. It's about
10:13:44 15 the market. It's about what people are doing in the
10:13:47 16 marketplace, what other banks are doing. That's 427. You
10:13:50 17 can look at that one, too.

10:13:52 18 And you heard time and again that it's totally
10:13:55 19 appropriate and normal for banks to look at what other
10:13:59 20 banks are doing, to go on YouTube, to go to conferences, to
10:14:04 21 listen to descriptions of things, to watch what other banks
10:14:07 22 are doing in the marketplace. It's why -- it's the way
10:14:10 23 business works, and the way we want it to work.

10:14:12 24 Duplicate detection. That was something that
10:14:18 25 Mr. Weinstein said was a big deal, one of the fraud

10:14:21 1 prevention features. It's been an issue since checks were
10:14:24 2 created many, many years ago. That's not something they
10:14:29 3 can claim credit for.

10:14:30 4 Now, this is something that you may remember in
10:14:33 5 the trial, and they've brought it up, and I predict they'll
10:14:36 6 bring it up again. This was something they found in our
10:14:39 7 files where we were looking at some screenshots -- some
10:14:42 8 screenshots of the USAA mobile app. And they say, well,
10:14:45 9 look at these arrows. These arrows are pointing right to
10:14:49 10 our patents.

10:14:50 11 I hope looking at this document -- ask for it,
10:14:52 12 it's 1182 -- that you'll see that that argument is just
10:14:57 13 not -- it's disrespectful. That's not what's going on
10:15:00 14 here.

10:15:00 15 As Mr. Hecht explained to you, people look at
10:15:02 16 other people's applications. And you can't learn anything
10:15:05 17 about how the system works by looking at screenshots.
10:15:11 18 That's not an X-ray into the system. That's not opening up
10:15:14 19 the code and looking at it. That was disrespectful. That
10:15:19 20 was an exaggeration meant to get you upset or think there's
10:15:24 21 something sinister, when it's nothing of the kind.

10:15:26 22 In fact, their own inventors testified. You may
10:15:29 23 remember Mr. Oakes said that they look at other competitors
10:15:33 24 all the time, and, indeed, did that when they were coming
10:15:37 25 up with their own innovations at USAA.

10:15:39 1 We brought you Mr. Saffici. He told you first why
10:15:45 2 this written description issue is so important. It's
10:15:51 3 important because we want to keep inventors honest about
10:15:53 4 their work. We don't want them to be able to create a new
10:15:56 5 patent with new claims and new ideas and claim it was
10:15:59 6 supported by earlier specifications. We don't want people
10:16:02 7 to lay in wait for 10 years -- for 10 years and then jump
10:16:11 8 in with a patent application in 2017 and claim, you know
10:16:14 9 what, I actually invented this in 2006. That's the
10:16:17 10 requirement that you must act as a check and balance on.

10:16:20 11 Yes, the patent issued, but you've got to look at
10:16:23 12 that specification and determine, does it really have what
10:16:27 13 USAA is claiming?

10:16:28 14 And we asked him: Does it describe PDAs in a way
10:16:32 15 that would suggest you could use a PDA with check
10:16:36 16 processing?

10:16:36 17 No, there's no description of that.

10:16:38 18 Is there any indication that the examiner
10:16:41 19 considered the specific issues?

10:16:43 20 Now, these file histories are lengthy, many, many
10:16:46 21 pages. Yes, they're presumed to have looked at this, but
10:16:49 22 there's no indication -- this is all he was saying --
10:16:52 23 there's no specific indication that he looked at this and
10:16:55 24 matched up these words and matched up these descriptions to
10:16:58 25 the full scope of the claims.

10:17:00 1 THE COURT: 15 minutes have been used.

10:17:04 2 MR. MELSHEIMER: So who did we ask that would know
10:17:07 3 best? Who do you think would know best about what's in
10:17:11 4 their invention? The inventors. We're the ones that
10:17:14 5 brought you most of the inventor testimony.

10:17:16 6 In addition to not bringing you Mr. Calman, they
10:17:19 7 didn't bring you any inventor live and in court. We
10:17:22 8 brought you the inventors by deposition.

10:17:26 9 You heard from Mr. Harpel. Is there a difference
10:17:29 10 between a portable device comprising a general purpose
10:17:31 11 computer and the digital camera?

10:17:32 12 Yes, the digital camera is separate from the
10:17:37 13 portable device.

10:17:38 14 And that's the whole point, folks. Their
10:17:40 15 specification talks about two devices. It doesn't describe
10:17:44 16 something that is integrated. And that's what they're
10:17:47 17 claiming their patents cover.

10:17:52 18 Do either of those patents describe any computing
10:17:54 19 device with the camera integrated in the same device as the
10:17:57 20 computer processor?

10:17:58 21 This man was the inventor. Don't you think they
10:18:01 22 had him pore over that specification before his deposition?
10:18:04 23 Don't you think when asked this question, if he really
10:18:07 24 invented this back in 2006, he'd say, you know, I know
10:18:12 25 exactly where that is. It's Column 5. It's Line 17. He

10:18:16 1 couldn't do that because it's not in there.

10:18:18 2 Webcams. They said, well, we were using webcams.
10:18:25 3 But it's important to remember the webcam was a separate
10:18:30 4 piece of hardware that you would plug into the computer.
10:18:32 5 They would be separate from the computer. It wasn't part
10:18:35 6 of the computer.

10:18:35 7 And we -- finally, Mr. Morlen, we talked to him,
10:18:41 8 another inventor. He said there's no discussion in this
10:18:44 9 patent of an integrated computer and image capture device,
10:18:47 10 which they are claiming now is the breadth of their patent,
10:18:49 11 and it's not in there.

10:18:53 12 No inventor, folks. No inventor testified that
10:18:56 13 the specification describes a mobile device and a camera
10:18:59 14 together, not Mr. Oakes, not Mr. Huth, not Mr. Harpel, not
10:19:04 15 Mr. Morlen.

10:19:05 16 We brought you Dr. Villasenor. He explained why
10:19:09 17 the accused Wells Fargo product does not infringe, because
10:19:16 18 it's missing that one key element. And one element is
10:19:19 19 enough to be missing.

10:19:20 20 And you finally heard from Mr. Gerardi, who
10:19:25 21 apportioned what Mr. Weinstein didn't do. He didn't look
10:19:29 22 at the value of the claimed improvements. He didn't look
10:19:33 23 at the value of what was new in the invention. He just
10:19:43 24 said, well, fraud detection, fraud prevention, that sounds
10:19:47 25 valuable, doesn't it? We want our checks to be protected

10:19:52 1 from fraud.

10:19:53 2 But the problem is you can't get paid for
10:19:55 3 something you didn't invent, and you shouldn't get paid for
10:19:59 4 something you didn't invent. It's not fair, and it's not
10:20:02 5 respectful.

10:20:02 6 One other exhibit I want to you to look at if you
10:20:11 7 want to ask for it, in addition to the patents, is
10:20:12 8 Exhibit 36, Exhibit 230, and Exhibit 267 -- the patents,
10:20:18 9 Exhibit 36, 230, and 267. Those are all exhibits that will
10:20:22 10 show you that these fraud prevention features, these
10:20:26 11 duplicate detection matters, these are all old, old
10:20:31 12 technology that predate these patents.

10:20:36 13 And when you're thinking about this blank page
10:20:39 14 where Mr. Weinstein could not identify the -- in the claims
10:20:44 15 where this value was, it's because he knew that that was
10:20:52 16 not something that had actually been invented.

10:20:55 17 Now, there's other evidence, of course, and you
10:20:57 18 should consider all of it fairly in using your common
10:21:01 19 sense.

10:21:02 20 Ms. Williams is now going to speak to you about
10:21:04 21 how the evidence fits into the charge. I want to say one
10:21:07 22 thing to you, though. Sometimes things come to you at the
10:21:10 23 very end. I've been driving back and forth to court, and
10:21:13 24 there's a store on the corner of Alamo and Houston Street
10:21:18 25 that's called the Computer Box store. And I drive by it

10:21:24 1 every day coming to court. And the sign on the store says
10:21:28 2 "everything." That's what the window says, "everything."

10:21:35 3 Now, I don't think that -- they claim to have
10:21:36 4 everything. But if you looked inside the store, I bet you
10:21:40 5 find that they don't. And that's the story of these
10:21:44 6 patents in this case. They want to claim something very
10:21:45 7 broad that's everything, but when you really look inside,
10:21:51 8 they've got some things missing.

10:21:52 9 Thank you very much for your time. I appreciate
10:21:55 10 it.

10:22:10 11 MS. WILLIAMS: May it please the Court. Good
10:22:11 12 morning.

10:22:11 13 THE COURT: Proceed.

10:22:12 14 MS. WILLIAMS: Now that Mr. Melsheimer has
10:22:15 15 reviewed the evidence with you, I want to take the time to
10:22:19 16 see how the law that Judge -- Judge Gilstrap gave you
10:22:22 17 applies to it.

10:22:22 18 There are four questions on the verdict form. The
10:22:27 19 first question is: Did USAA prove by a preponderance of
10:22:31 20 the evidence that Wells Fargo infringed any of the asserted
10:22:35 21 claims?

10:22:35 22 The Court's instructions say that if a product is
10:22:40 23 missing even one element or limitation of a claim, it does
10:22:44 24 not meet all of the requirements of the claim and is not
10:22:47 25 covered by the claim. If a product is not covered by the

10:22:52 1 claim, it does not infringe that claim.

10:22:54 2 And, here, Wells Fargo Mobile Deposit is missing
10:22:59 3 one element from every claim of the '681 patent, the
10:23:05 4 confirming step.

10:23:06 5 Wells Fargo does not do the confirming step on the
10:23:11 6 device. It is on the server. And because of that, there
10:23:16 7 is no infringement.

10:23:19 8 Dr. Villasenor also informed you about another
10:23:23 9 important requirement that applies in a case like this.

10:23:29 10 As the Court just instructed you, infringement
10:23:32 11 requires that a single party be responsible for
10:23:39 12 infringement of the claim. But both Dr. Conte and
10:23:43 13 Dr. Villasenor agree that the claims of the patents at
10:23:46 14 issue here require that both the mobile device and the bank
10:23:51 15 servers do certain things. That means the claim is
10:23:56 16 divided.

10:23:57 17 That's the way USAA chose to write the claim. And
10:24:01 18 there's nothing wrong with that. But what that means here
10:24:03 19 is that, because the claim is divided, USAA must also prove
10:24:08 20 that Wells Fargo combines the elements of the claims, even
10:24:16 21 if it doesn't make each individual component or Wells Fargo
10:24:20 22 controls the system and obtains benefits from it. And that
10:24:24 23 means it obtains benefits from each and every element of
10:24:31 24 the claimed system.

10:24:32 25 The Court instructed you that it's USAA's burden

10:24:34 1 to prove that, and USAA called one witness, one witness, to
10:24:41 2 prove infringement, Dr. Conte.

10:24:43 3 And Dr. Conte simply didn't do this analysis.

10:24:53 4 He was asked: You think in your direct
10:24:56 5 examination, you went through each element and explained
10:24:58 6 how it benefitted the bank versus how it benefitted the
10:25:01 7 customer?

10:25:02 8 And his answer was: Oh, no, I didn't do that.

10:25:07 9 And Dr. Villasenor checked Dr. Conte's work, and
10:25:10 10 he also concluded that Dr. Conte didn't do that.

10:25:12 11 Dr. Conte did not perform the analysis that the
10:25:19 12 law requires.

10:25:20 13 So for Question 1 on the verdict form, Wells Fargo
10:25:25 14 does not infringe any claim of either patent, and so the
10:25:29 15 answer to Question No. 1 is no.

10:25:32 16 The second question is: Did Wells Fargo prove by
10:25:39 17 clear and convincing evidence that any of the following
10:25:42 18 asserted claims are invalid?

10:25:43 19 As the Court instructed you, even though the
10:25:48 20 Patent Office granted these patents, you and you alone have
10:25:56 21 the ultimate responsibility for deciding the validity of
10:26:01 22 the claims in this case.

10:26:02 23 USAA filed these patents on July 28th, 2017, for
10:26:10 24 an invention it claims it invented in 2006. The evidence
10:26:16 25 presented to you this week shows that these patents are not

10:26:20 1 entitled to go back 10 years to Halloween 2006.

10:26:27 2 And why is that? Because USAA can't claim in 2017
10:26:31 3 what it didn't write down in 2006.

10:26:36 4 The law says the specification is required to
10:26:39 5 contain a written description of the claimed invention
10:26:42 6 telling what the invention is, how it works, how to make
10:26:47 7 it, and how to use it. And that is because under our laws,
10:26:50 8 the written description requirement helps ensure that the
10:26:56 9 patent applicant actually -- actually invented the claimed
10:27:01 10 subject matter.

10:27:02 11 The law says that exact words don't need to be in
10:27:06 12 there, but to satisfy -- to satisfy the written description
10:27:13 13 requirement, the patent specification must describe each
10:27:16 14 and every limitation of the patent claim in sufficient
10:27:21 15 detail.

10:27:22 16 Now, USAA, I expect, is going to try and focus
10:27:27 17 your attention on a part of the law that says you don't
10:27:30 18 have to spell out every detail. And I expect they may show
10:27:38 19 you some of this on Page 17 of the charge. And I want you
10:27:42 20 to watch for it because I think they'll only show you half
10:27:46 21 of a sentence from this charge on written description.

10:27:49 22 The law says a lot more than that. And this
10:27:57 23 Court's charge in this very sentence says more than that.
10:28:00 24 The law requires enough detail in the specification to
10:28:04 25 convince persons of ordinary skill in the art that the

10:28:07 1 inventor -- inventor possessed the full scope of the
10:28:11 2 invention -- the full scope of the invention.

10:28:13 3 The Court said the specification must describe the
10:28:17 4 claimed invention in such a way that a person of ordinary
10:28:21 5 skill in the art would understand that the larger category
10:28:25 6 that is being claimed has been invented and not just the
10:28:28 7 single example.

10:28:30 8 In this case, the only evidence presented to you
10:28:34 9 in this trial on written description was from Mr. Saffici.
10:28:40 10 He told you the old specifications only cover a general
10:28:46 11 purpose computer and an image capture device.

10:28:49 12 But in 2017, USAA claimed more than that. In
10:28:54 13 2017, USAA claimed the -- the original invention and
10:28:58 14 something new, something it did not describe in the 2006
10:29:03 15 specifications, a mobile device with a digital camera.

10:29:07 16 USA -- USAA wants to go on a word search, but it's
10:29:13 17 not enough to find the words disjointed in the patents. As
10:29:17 18 I told you in opening statement, context matters. And
10:29:21 19 Mr. Saffici is the only person -- the only person who took
10:29:26 20 that stand as an expert qualified from -- qualified by this
10:29:31 21 Court to put those words in context for you.

10:29:34 22 And Mr. Saffici, with his 53 years of hands-on
10:29:38 23 experience in this exact area of technology, told you that
10:29:45 24 the old specifications do not support USAA's new claims to
10:29:50 25 a mobile device with a camera or a portable device with a

10:29:55 1 camera together in a single unit.

10:29:56 2 Members of the jury, clear and convincing evidence
10:30:00 3 of this is right there in your notebook. Figure 1 of both
10:30:07 4 the patents shows a general purpose computer at 111 and a
10:30:11 5 separate image capture device at 212.

10:30:15 6 They are not shown in a single unit, and you will
10:30:19 7 not find them described in the specifications as a single
10:30:24 8 unit anywhere.

10:30:26 9 Here, in Figure 3 from the '605 patent -- excuse
10:30:35 10 me, here, Figure 3 in the '605 patent describes the image
10:30:40 11 capture device as a scanner, as a digital camera, but in
10:30:46 12 both cases as a device, with communication connections to
10:30:57 13 couple a general purpose computer as shown in a separate
10:30:59 14 Figure 2 that has been shown to you throughout this trial,
10:31:08 15 and it is in your notebook.

10:31:09 16 USAA points you to this passage in '605 -- in the
10:31:13 17 '605 patent about PDAs. But there's nothing in here about
10:31:15 18 using a PDA, an MP3 player, or a television for check
10:31:25 19 deposit. The use of the word "PDA" in the specification no
10:31:29 20 more discloses the full scope of the invention in the
10:31:31 21 claims than the mention of the word "dormitories" does.

10:31:38 22 When we look at Figure 4, nothing discloses
10:31:40 23 depositing checks with a PDA. There is nothing about the
10:31:46 24 specification in either one of these patents that discloses
10:31:48 25 the full scope of the claims in the patents. The

10:31:53 1 specification is the foundation -- the foundation of the
10:31:57 2 claims. Here, USAA filed claims 10 years after the --
10:32:03 3 after the fact without adequate foundation.

10:32:05 4 Every USAA employee, every USAA inventor testified
10:32:14 5 that USAA was not working on mobile phones in 2006. USAA
10:32:22 6 didn't start until 2007. Instead, in 2006 -- in 2006, when
10:32:27 7 USAA wrote its old specification, the foundation of
10:32:30 8 everything that we've been talking about this week, USAA
10:32:34 9 was only connecting two separate devices.

10:32:39 10 Not a single inventor took the stand to say
10:32:45 11 otherwise. Not a single inventor took the stand to tell
10:32:48 12 you the specification describes a mobile phone or a mobile
10:32:52 13 device and a camera together. Not one.

10:32:55 14 And not a single witness testified that the
10:32:59 15 patents were valid. The only witness to testify on the
10:33:03 16 issue of validity was Mr. Saffici.

10:33:06 17 Because the patents are not entitled to that old
10:33:13 18 Halloween 2006 date, the earliest priority date they can
10:33:19 19 have is July 28th, 2017. And because of that, the old 2006
10:33:23 20 patents anticipate the asserted patents, and the asserted
10:33:26 21 patents are invalid.

10:33:27 22 Mr. Saffici wasn't confused. He's the only person
10:33:32 23 who applied the standards of invalidity in this case and
10:33:37 24 the only person who testified regarding validity in this
10:33:42 25 case.

10:33:43 1 So for Question 2, all the claims rise and fall
10:33:46 2 together. Each claim is invalid. So the answer to
10:33:51 3 Question 2 for each claim is yes.

10:33:54 4 The third question, if you get to it, is: Did
10:34:01 5 USAA prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the
10:34:04 6 infringement you found in Question 1 was willful? The law
10:34:08 7 says to be willful, you must find that Wells Fargo acted
10:34:13 8 egregiously, willfully, or wantonly.

10:34:17 9 And when we look at the totality of the
10:34:19 10 circumstances, there is no willfulness here. Here, the
10:34:21 11 patents issued in 2018, and USAA sued Wells Fargo just
10:34:27 12 weeks after the patents issued.

10:34:29 13 The case is important to Wells Fargo, and the
10:34:31 14 rights to challenge USAA's patents is important to Wells
10:34:35 15 Fargo. There has been no evidence that Wells Fargo has
10:34:38 16 acted reckless -- in reckless disregard or in callous
10:34:43 17 disregard to USAA's rights to these patents that issued in
10:34:48 18 July 2018.

10:34:49 19 The answer to Question No. 3 is no.

10:34:56 20 The fourth question is: What sum of money if paid
10:35:01 21 now in cash has USAA proven by a preponderance of the
10:35:06 22 evidence would compensate USAA for its damages resulting
10:35:10 23 from infringement beginning on August 17th, 2018, through
10:35:14 24 the date of trial?

10:35:15 25 You only reach this question if you find that the

10:35:19 1 patents are infringed and not invalid. And we don't think
10:35:24 2 you're going to reach this question.

10:35:26 3 But if you do reach this question, then USAA has
10:35:29 4 the burden to establish the amount of damages by a
10:35:34 5 preponderance -- preponderance of the evidence.

10:35:36 6 USAA has to prove its damages just like it has to
10:35:39 7 prove its other issues in this case. If it's not proven,
10:35:45 8 they haven't met their burden.

10:35:47 9 The law requires that the amount of damages must
10:35:52 10 be based on the value attributable to the patented
10:35:56 11 technology alone.

10:36:00 12 USAA's expert agrees that the value is this
10:36:03 13 incremental contribution, what is new about the patent that
10:36:10 14 didn't exist before. And if you don't claim it in the
10:36:14 15 claims, a damages expert can't attribute value to it.

10:36:18 16 Now, Mobile Deposit is something that is important
10:36:22 17 to Wells Fargo. That's what table stakes means. But what
10:36:29 18 they're claiming as value, these fraud prevention features,
10:36:33 19 that's not a table stake. That's old technology.

10:36:35 20 THE COURT: Five minutes remaining.

10:36:40 21 MS. WILLIAMS: Repeating a saying, like a buzz
10:36:43 22 word, does it change the fact that what you have to value
10:36:45 23 here is what is claimed in the patent? And that is true
10:36:47 24 for the \$40 million number and the hundred million dollar
10:36:51 25 number.

10:36:53 1 The only credible evidence presented on damages is
10:37:01 2 from Wells Fargo, from Mr. Gerardi, and he went through his
10:37:03 3 three-step process for the apportionment.

10:37:05 4 He took into consideration things that aren't
10:37:09 5 claimed in the invention, including the hard work of Wells
10:37:12 6 Fargo to put together the systems that it uses, including
10:37:15 7 the fact that USAA hasn't licensed its patents to anyone,
10:37:20 8 and determined that a reasonable royalty -- excuse me, a --
10:37:25 9 determined that the damages in this case are \$3.98 million
10:37:29 10 for a lump sum for the patents. And that is the only
10:37:35 11 credible -- credible evidence that has been presented to
10:37:37 12 you.

10:37:38 13 If you reach Question 4, the answer is no more
10:37:42 14 than 3.98 million for a lump-sum license -- excuse me, 3.98
10:37:52 15 million for compensation.

10:37:56 16 Members of the jury, USAA has a simple strategy.
10:38:00 17 You've seen it all week. You've seen it this morning.
10:38:03 18 You're going to see it when I sit down, and I don't have a
10:38:06 19 chance to stand up again. USAA's strategy is to create a
10:38:09 20 false narrative. Like I said in opening, sound bites
10:38:13 21 create a lot of drama, but they don't help us get to the
10:38:17 22 truth.

10:38:17 23 And how have they executed this strategy? Well,
10:38:21 24 overstate your rights. Patents are constitutional rights.
10:38:24 25 That's not true.

10:38:25 1 Patent rights are absolute. That's not true.

10:38:28 2 Wells Fargo's only choices are to vacate or ask
10:38:30 3 permission. That is not true.

10:38:32 4 The Patent Office issued the patents so written --
10:38:36 5 written description can't be questioned. That is not true.

10:38:39 6 These patents provide new fraud prevention
10:38:42 7 protections. That is not true.

10:38:44 8 These patents are as big as the iPhone and as
10:38:47 9 important as the Google search engine and worth a hundred
10:38:51 10 million dollars. That is not true.

10:38:53 11 Step 2 in the strategy has been to mischaracterize
10:38:57 12 the documents and the testimony showing only parts of
10:39:01 13 documents and only parts of definitions. You were here
10:39:05 14 yesterday and saw -- and saw it from the start of the day
10:39:07 15 to the end of the day. Confront witnesses with consistent
10:39:12 16 and incomplete quotes. Suggest normal business activities
10:39:17 17 are misdeeds when their own inventor said he did the exact
10:39:22 18 same thing. Unfairly malign and disrespect witnesses to
10:39:26 19 make them look bad. Repeatedly saying buzz words like
10:39:31 20 "table stakes," suggesting that it's a misdeed. Flashing
10:39:35 21 big numbers up that have no connection to any actual value
10:39:38 22 relevant to the inventions in this case.

10:39:41 23 And the third step has been to hide the motives
10:39:44 24 and those who could actually provide the information. We
10:39:47 25 don't bring all the actual inventors who might actually say

10:39:51 1 live in court that the 2006 specification never envisioned
10:39:56 2 mobile phones with cameras. Ignore the new patents are all
10:39:59 3 about mobile phones. Forget what the 2006 specification
10:40:02 4 says. And ignore the obvious motive to snare your
10:40:06 5 competitors with new claims tacked on 10 years later.

10:40:11 6 You are the check and balance. This is an
10:40:13 7 important dispute. We respect the process. We respect
10:40:19 8 your part in this process. They are counting on this
10:40:23 9 process not to work the way it's supposed to.

10:40:27 10 Everyone will go home after your verdict. Your
10:40:37 11 verdict will send USAA home with one of two messages.
10:40:43 12 Either you can't claim in 2017 what you didn't write down
10:40:47 13 in 2006, or you got away with it. Please don't let them
10:40:54 14 get away with it.

10:40:56 15 Thank you.

10:40:56 16 THE COURT: Plaintiff may now present its final
10:41:02 17 closing argument.

10:41:10 18 MR. SHEASBY: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury,
10:41:16 19 the first question you will be asked to consider is
10:41:21 20 infringement. There was no discussion whatsoever of the
10:41:27 21 '605 patent in Wells Fargo's 40 minutes of presentation.
10:41:31 22 There's a reason for that. They have no technical basis on
10:41:35 23 which to dispute the infringement of the '605 patent.

10:41:38 24 Now, there is an interesting argument, and the
10:41:41 25 interesting argument is that Wells Fargo doesn't control

10:41:44 1 and benefit from the system that it constructs. That's
10:41:49 2 what they're trying to tell you.

10:41:50 3 Well, let's look at the evidence. Professor
10:41:54 4 Conte, who is the only expert who analyzed it, said
10:41:57 5 expressly that Wells Fargo ultimately controls the software
10:41:59 6 and the hardware. That was Wells -- that was USAA's --
10:42:03 7 Dr. Conte's analysis. It was not disputed.

10:42:06 8 Do you really think a bank with more branches and
10:42:09 9 more tellers than any other bank in the United States that
10:42:14 10 is using a system to, as Ms. Lockwood say -- says, generate
10:42:20 11 at least a dollar every time the system is used, doesn't
10:42:24 12 control and benefit from each element of that system?

10:42:26 13 One of your most powerful tools is common sense.
10:42:30 14 What does common sense tell you about their claim that it's
10:42:34 15 their customer's fault and that they don't control and
10:42:38 16 benefit from each element of the system?

10:42:40 17 The next question you must consider is
10:42:46 18 willfulness. You can still be liable for infringement even
10:42:47 19 if you are willful.

10:42:48 20 And Mr. -- Mr. Melsheimer said two things, and I
10:42:53 21 wrote them down because they were important to me.

10:42:55 22 First, he said that USAA laid in wait for 10
10:43:00 23 years. But that has no connection to reality because
10:43:06 24 Mr. Hecht, Wells Fargo's corporate representative, although
10:43:11 25 he first denied it, admitted that since 2007 -- '10,

10:43:17 1 they've been tracking our patents.

10:43:18 2 The reason why this is occurring now is because
10:43:20 3 USAA took the right steps, as Mr. Brady explained. We went
10:43:23 4 to the Patent Office. We re-presented our claims, and we
10:43:28 5 asked them to confirm the scope of our right.

10:43:29 6 The reason why there are no licenses is because
10:43:31 7 the step we have to take to get Wells Fargo, the bank with
10:43:37 8 more branches and more tellers than -- and more ATMs than
10:43:41 9 other banks in the United States to take responsibility for
10:43:43 10 its conduct is a federal court. And we wish that wasn't
10:43:46 11 the case.

10:43:47 12 But when we approached them about licensing, what
10:43:50 13 you heard happen, even though Wells Fargo's corporate
10:43:53 14 representative didn't even know about it, we were forced to
10:43:58 15 come here.

10:43:58 16 Now, Mr. Melsheimer said something else which I
10:44:02 17 think is very important. He says we're an innovative
10:44:05 18 company. Well, words are just words. We have the
10:44:10 19 confidential records from Wells Fargo's executives, which
10:44:14 20 admit that they had no capability to create this system.
10:44:18 21 That's what's in the record.

10:44:20 22 And then he said something else. He said this is
10:44:23 23 just the way business works. This is the way we want
10:44:27 24 business to work.

10:44:30 25 Let me be very clear. Leveraging USAA's designs

10:44:36 1 is maybe the way Wells Fargo's business works, but it's not
10:44:40 2 the way USAA's business works. And it's not the way
10:44:43 3 business in the United States should work.

10:44:46 4 Wells Fargo had no right to leverage the labor of
10:44:50 5 the Applied Research Division, and they have no right to
10:44:53 6 come here and stand here and tell you, that's just the way
10:44:57 7 it works, folks. That's how business works. That's how we
10:45:00 8 want business to work.

10:45:01 9 The next issue you're going to be asked to decide
10:45:06 10 is validity. And one of the things that I think is really
10:45:12 11 important is to understand what this invention is about.

10:45:17 12 One of the issues I struggled with throughout this
10:45:20 13 week is I could never get an explanation from any Wells
10:45:25 14 Fargo witness, why does it matter for the invention whether
10:45:28 15 the camera is separate or connected? What's this invention
10:45:32 16 about? This invention is about using a digital camera,
10:45:36 17 connecting it to a general purpose processor, and then
10:45:39 18 using software so that you can control that camera to
10:45:42 19 cap -- capture the picture. That's the powerful insight,
10:45:45 20 the sophisticated software system that was created.

10:45:48 21 Nothing turns on the number of boxes you have.
10:45:52 22 And because nothing turns on the number of boxes you have,
10:45:55 23 the specification said we don't care. Communicatively
10:46:00 24 couple it any way you want. That's what makes it powerful.

10:46:04 25 They're turning the power of the insight of the

10:46:08 1 inventors and using it as a criticism. Wells Fargo doesn't
10:46:13 2 recognize something because they're not USAA. Wells Fargo
10:46:18 3 made its members buy these expensive scanners.

10:46:22 4 And what did we do to our members? We created a
10:46:25 5 foundation that can be used with any digital device you can
10:46:29 6 imagine. And 10 years from now, when there's a different
10:46:32 7 digital device, this system can still use it. And that was
10:46:37 8 the power in 2006.

10:46:45 9 Mr. Saffici admitted this was novel and
10:46:49 10 non-obvious. If this wasn't an invention, if this wasn't
10:46:53 11 powerful, if what we invented was old, then how could it be
10:46:59 12 novel and non-obvious?

10:47:00 13 Common sense.

10:47:04 14 Dr. Conte pointed to the specification, pointed
10:47:07 15 that it expressly said any device a consumer can use, as
10:47:13 16 long as it has a camera, we can meet you where you are.
10:47:17 17 And he testified under oath, without contradiction, that
10:47:21 18 everyone knew in 2006 that consumer devices had digital
10:47:26 19 cameras as part of them.

10:47:27 20 Mr. Saffici -- this is his testimony. This is his
10:47:35 21 testimony under oath. You said that the specification
10:47:39 22 teaches that the handheld device may include a digital
10:47:41 23 camera?

10:47:41 24 For the last 40 minutes they have been trying to
10:47:49 25 convince you that this specification doesn't teach a

10:47:51 1 digital device that can include -- a handheld device that
10:47:57 2 can include a digital camera. Literally, they've spent the
10:48:01 3 last 40 minutes trying to teach you that. And their own
10:48:04 4 witness admitted it repeatedly on the stand.

10:48:07 5 Figure 3. Figure 3 shows a device that
10:48:13 6 Mr. Saffici was -- admitted -- admitted to on examination
10:48:16 7 has within it an image capture apparatus and a general
10:48:20 8 purpose processing device. It can be connected directly to
10:48:24 9 a server, it can be connected to another computer, and it's
10:48:28 10 all in one box.

10:48:29 11 Now, why is USAA's inventors teaching it this way?
10:48:34 12 Why are they teaching it all in one box? And the reason is
10:48:38 13 because they don't care. They don't care because they meet
10:48:44 14 their members where they are, and that's exactly what the
10:48:51 15 specification teaches in Figure 3. Connect it directly to
10:48:55 16 a server, connect it to another computer, we don't care
10:48:58 17 because we are here to meet you.

10:49:00 18 Mr. Brady said it clear. It was irrelevant to
10:49:07 19 USAA what physical box housed the digital camera. It's not
10:49:10 20 relevant to our goals, and it's not relevant to the goals
10:49:13 21 of the patents. And you didn't hear one witness, one
10:49:16 22 witness that said the number of boxes you use has any
10:49:21 23 connection to any of the issues, any of the problems of
10:49:26 24 image quality that this patent is so focused on.

10:49:32 25 One of the most striking comments that was made in

10:49:35 1 the last 40 minutes is the claim that no inventor -- that
10:49:39 2 all the inventors testified that they didn't do any work on
10:49:42 3 mobile phones before 2007.

10:49:44 4 Now, let me -- 2007. Now, let me be absolutely
10:49:47 5 clear. That is an irrelevant argument. It's a
10:49:52 6 distraction. It doesn't matter what devices we use because
10:49:55 7 the system we built works with all devices. It just so
10:50:00 8 happens to be inaccurate.

10:50:01 9 Mr. Oakes, the head of Applied Research, made it
10:50:04 10 clear that before October of 2006, USAA was already
10:50:08 11 experimenting with mobile phones. It's irrelevant. It's
10:50:13 12 legally irrelevant, but it is unfortunately the case that I
10:50:19 13 have to stand here and show that statements that were made
10:50:22 14 to you just minutes ago have no connection whatsoever to
10:50:26 15 reality or to the record in this case.

10:50:28 16 The last issue we're going to discuss is damages.
10:50:46 17 Here's what the record evidence shows. \$3.50 when we use
10:50:51 18 their ATM. 60 cents when we use the Zelle system they
10:50:57 19 partially own.

10:50:58 20 What does USAA get? Wells Fargo says you get
10:51:03 21 3 cents, you get a cent. You should feel lucky. That's
10:51:08 22 just the way business works, USAA.

10:51:09 23 I respectfully submit you -- to you that's not the
10:51:13 24 way business works. The reality is that Wells Fargo's own
10:51:16 25 expert admit -- Wells Fargo's own corporate representative

10:51:19 1 admits that in just one year, it saved between 60 and
10:51:24 2 \$120 million from using mobile remote deposit capture.

10:51:29 3 And what's interesting about that analysis is it
10:51:36 4 actually does exactly what Wells Fargo said should be done.
10:51:40 5 Wells Fargo said we shouldn't get any credit for the back
10:51:45 6 end. We shouldn't get any credit for the back end that
10:51:48 7 they said existed before.

10:51:49 8 But if you remember, they told you that all the
10:51:52 9 different routes, teller, ATM, MRDC, all feed into the same
10:51:59 10 background. They use that phrase funnels within funnels.

10:52:04 11 This is what the analysis shows. All these three
10:52:07 12 channels use the same back end. It's \$2.40 for the teller.
10:52:13 13 It's \$1.41 for the ATM. And it's 35 cents for MRDC.

10:52:20 14 The front end. The MRDC system that USAA
10:52:24 15 developed saves Wells Fargo between a dollar and \$2.00
10:52:29 16 every single time it uses it. That's what's in the record.
10:52:32 17 And there are 120 million infringing deposits using this
10:52:36 18 system -- 120 million during the damages period alone.

10:52:42 19 A second way you can think about value is that
10:52:49 20 Wells Fargo made \$1.2 billion solely during the damages
10:52:55 21 period from the MRDC system, in profits.

10:53:01 22 And by the way, even Wells Fargo's own expert who
10:53:04 23 says we get a penny and we should feel lucky for it
10:53:08 24 admitted that Wells Fargo made \$339 million from the MRDC
10:53:15 25 system alone in just one year.

10:53:23 1 THE COURT: You have five minutes remaining,
10:53:25 2 counsel.

10:53:25 3 MR. SHEASBY: The reason for that power is because
10:53:31 4 the claims at issue --

10:53:36 5 Can I have Slide 55, Mr. Huynh?

10:53:40 6 -- are not narrow. They're not trivial. They're
10:53:45 7 broad for the foundation of MRDC, which is what Wells
10:53:52 8 Fargo's expert has admitted.

10:53:57 9 I -- when we talked on Monday, at the end of it, I
10:54:01 10 talked about how the fact that I wanted you to think of
10:54:04 11 jury service as not just a duty but a right. And I've been
10:54:10 12 thinking about that a lot more this week, which is that
10:54:12 13 this has been a hard week. It's been very long. It's been
10:54:17 14 very complicated.

10:54:19 15 But 231 years ago, the founders placed this in our
10:54:23 16 hands. They placed the responsibility to decide very
10:54:28 17 important questions in our hands.

10:54:30 18 And it remains that way today, and it will remain
10:54:35 19 that way in the future for as long as we have our republic.
10:54:40 20 And I think that's something sacred. I think this power in
10:54:45 21 your hands is very important. USAA is in your hands. Our
10:54:53 22 members are in your hands. Chuck Oakes, the Applied
10:54:58 23 Research decision -- division is in your hands. The
10:55:01 24 decades of research, the hundreds of millions of dollars
10:55:04 25 that led to this are in your hands.

10:55:07 1 Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, this case is --
10:55:09 2 this case is in your hands, and I thank you for your time.
10:55:13 3 And USAA thanks you.

10:55:16 4 THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, I'd
10:55:24 5 like to give you a few final instructions before you begin
10:55:27 6 your deliberations.

10:55:28 7 You must perform your duty as jurors without bias
10:55:33 8 or prejudice as to any party. The law does not permit you
10:55:37 9 to be controlled by sympathy, prejudice, or public opinion.
10:55:43 10 All parties expect that you will carefully and impartially
10:55:47 11 consider all the evidence, follow the law as I have given
10:55:53 12 it to you, and reach a just verdict, regardless of the
10:55:57 13 consequences.

10:55:58 14 Answer each question in the verdict form based on
10:56:01 15 the facts as you find them to be, following the
10:56:04 16 instructions that the Court has given you on the law. As
10:56:10 17 I've said, do not decide who you think should win the case
10:56:13 18 and then answer the questions to reach that result. Again,
10:56:18 19 I remind you, your answers and your verdict must be
10:56:21 20 unanimous.

10:56:22 21 You should consider and decide this case as a
10:56:29 22 dispute between parties of equal standing in the community,
10:56:33 23 equal worth, and holding the same or similar stations in
10:56:35 24 life. This is true in patent cases between corporations,
10:56:39 25 partnerships, other business entities, and individuals.

10:56:43 1 A patent owner is entitled to protect his rights
10:56:46 2 under the laws of the United States. And this includes
10:56:49 3 bringing a suit in a United States District Court for money
10:56:53 4 damages for infringement.

10:56:56 5 The law recognizes no distinction amongst types of
10:57:00 6 parties. All corporations, partnerships, and other
10:57:03 7 business organizations stand equal before the law,
10:57:08 8 regardless of their size, regardless of who owns them, and
10:57:11 9 they are to be treated as equals.

10:57:13 10 Now, when you retire to the jury room to
10:57:16 11 deliberate on your verdict, as I've told you, you'll each
10:57:19 12 have a written copy of these final jury instructions to
10:57:22 13 take with you.

10:57:24 14 If during your deliberations you desire to review
10:57:27 15 any of the exhibits -- not the demonstratives, but the
10:57:32 16 exhibits which the Court has admitted into evidence, then
10:57:35 17 you should advise me by a written note signed by your
10:57:38 18 foreperson and delivered to the Court Security Officer who
10:57:41 19 will bring it to me. I will then send you that exhibit or
10:57:45 20 those exhibits.

10:57:47 21 Once you retire, you should first select your
10:57:50 22 foreperson and then conduct your deliberations. If you
10:57:57 23 recess during your deliberations, follow all the
10:58:00 24 instructions that the Court has given you about your
10:58:02 25 conduct during the trial.

10:58:04 1 After you've reached a unanimous verdict, your
10:58:06 2 foreperson is to fill in your answers to the questions in
10:58:10 3 the verdict form reflecting your unanimous decisions.

10:58:15 4 Do not reveal your answers until -- until such
10:58:18 5 time as you're discharged or otherwise directed by me. And
10:58:22 6 you must never disclose to anyone, not even to me, your
10:58:26 7 numerical division on any unanswered question.

10:58:29 8 Your notes, if you've taken them over the course
10:58:34 9 of the trial, are aids to your memory only. If your memory
10:58:37 10 should differ from your notes, then rely on your memory and
10:58:40 11 not your notes. The notes are not evidence, and a juror
10:58:45 12 who has not taken notes should rely on his or her own
10:58:48 13 independent recollection of the evidence and not be unduly
10:58:52 14 influenced by the notes of other jurors.

10:58:54 15 Notes are not entitled to any greater weight than
10:58:57 16 the recollection or impression of each juror about the
10:59:02 17 testimony.

10:59:02 18 If you want to communicate with me at any time
10:59:08 19 during your deliberations, you should give a written
10:59:11 20 question or a message to the jury -- or, excuse me, to the
10:59:13 21 Court Security Officer, signed by the jury foreperson, and
10:59:16 22 the Court Security Officer will then bring it to me.

10:59:18 23 I'll then re -- reply to you as promptly as
10:59:25 24 possible, either in writing or by having you brought back
10:59:28 25 into the jury -- into the courtroom where I can address you

10:59:31 1 orally.

10:59:32 2 I will always disclose to the attorneys in the
10:59:35 3 case for both parties your question and my response before
10:59:37 4 I answer your questions.

10:59:39 5 After you have reached a verdict and I have
10:59:43 6 discharged you from your role as jurors, you're not
10:59:47 7 required to talk with anyone about your service in this
10:59:49 8 case. But at that point, you will be free to talk with
10:59:53 9 anyone of your choosing about your service in the case.
10:59:57 10 That decision at that time will be yours and yours alone to
11:00:01 11 make.

11:00:01 12 I'm now going to hand one clean copy of the
11:00:05 13 verdict form and eight written copies of these instructions
11:00:08 14 to the Court Security Officer to deliver to the jury in the
11:00:11 15 jury room.

11:00:13 16 Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, you may now
11:00:25 17 retire to the jury room to deliberate. We await your
11:00:28 18 verdict.

11:00:29 19 COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.

11:00:31 20 (Jury out.)

11:00:32 21 THE COURT: Counsel, you are welcome to wait here
11:00:58 22 in the courtroom or the courthouse. I also understand that
11:01:03 23 you may wish to wait at locations away from the courthouse.
11:01:08 24 That's perfectly fine.

11:01:10 25 The Court has in its possession a cell phone

11:01:13 1 number for Mr. Bunt and Mr. Hill. In the event I need to
11:01:17 2 contact you upon receipt of a question or return of a
11:01:20 3 verdict, I'll call Mr. Bunt, and I'll call Mr. Hill to
11:01:24 4 notify each trial team. So those lawyers should have their
11:01:28 5 cell phones charged and turned on.

11:01:30 6 Also, I'm going to ask each side to select one
11:01:34 7 cell phone number from a member of its trial team that I
11:01:38 8 can give to the jury after I meet with them after I've
11:01:41 9 accepted their verdict so that they may, if they elect,
11:01:46 10 call that person to discuss their service as jurors and to
11:01:51 11 discuss the trial, if they choose to do so.

11:01:53 12 So if you will, among yourselves, pick one
11:01:56 13 person's name and phone number and give that to me and my
11:02:00 14 staff during the deliberations so I can give that to the
11:02:04 15 jury after I've accepted their verdict and before they
11:02:06 16 leave the courthouse.

11:02:07 17 They may choose to call and discuss their service.
11:02:10 18 They may not. But that's an additional option I've
11:02:14 19 recently been giving them, rather than them stopping you
11:02:19 20 outside on the front steps to talk about their service as
11:02:22 21 jurors.

11:02:22 22 All right. Counsel, awaiting either a question
11:02:26 23 from the jury or the return of a verdict, we stand in
11:02:29 24 recess.

11:02:30 25 COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.

11:02:33 1 (Recess.)

02:09:10 2 (Jury out.)

02:09:10 3 COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.

02:09:11 4 THE COURT: Be seated, please.

02:18:05 5 Counsel, the Court's received the following

02:18:24 6 message from the jury:

02:18:26 7 Quote, we have a verdict.

02:18:28 8 And it's signed by Mr. Johns, who, as I recall, is
02:18:34 9 Juror No. 3, as the foreperson.

02:18:36 10 I'm going to mark this -- since we've not received
02:18:40 11 any notes from the jury previously, I'm going to mark this
02:18:43 12 as Item 1, and I'll hand it to the courtroom deputy to be
02:18:46 13 included in this case.

02:18:47 14 All right. I'm about to bring the jury in and
02:18:51 15 receive the verdict.

02:18:52 16 As indicated, I'll remind everybody there should
02:18:57 17 be no outburst or audible or visual expressions no matter
02:19:02 18 what the result is.

02:19:04 19 All right. Is there any reason from either
02:19:09 20 Plaintiff or Defendant I should not bring the jury in and
02:19:12 21 receive the verdict at this time?

02:19:15 22 MR. SHEASBY: Nothing from Plaintiffs, Your Honor.

02:19:16 23 MR. HILL: No, Your Honor.

02:19:17 24 THE COURT: Let's bring in the jury, please,
02:19:20 25 Ms. Denton.

02:19:23 1 COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.

02:19:34 2 (Jury in.)

02:19:37 3 THE COURT: Please be seated.

02:19:48 4 Mr. Johns, I understand that you're the foreperson
02:19:57 5 of the jury; is that correct?

02:19:59 6 THE FOREPERSON: Yes, sir.

02:20:00 7 THE COURT: Has the jury reached a unanimous
02:20:02 8 verdict?

02:20:03 9 THE FOREPERSON: Yes, sir, we have.

02:20:05 10 THE COURT: Will you hand the completed form to
02:20:07 11 the Court Security Officer, who will bring it to me?

02:20:13 12 All right. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to
02:21:02 13 announce the verdict into the record at this time. And I'd
02:21:06 14 like to ask each member of the jury to listen very
02:21:10 15 carefully as I announce the record publicly -- the verdict
02:21:16 16 publicly. Because after I've done that, I'm going to poll
02:21:19 17 the jury to make sure that this is the unanimous verdict of
02:21:21 18 all eight members of our jury.

02:21:23 19 Turning to the verdict form, and beginning on
02:21:30 20 Page 4 where Question 1 is located: Did USAA prove by a
02:21:37 21 preponderance of the evidence that Wells Fargo infringed
02:21:40 22 any of the asserted claims?

02:21:42 23 The jury's answer is: Yes.

02:21:45 24 Turning to Page 5 where Question 2 of the verdict
02:21:51 25 form is located: Did Wells Fargo prove by clear and

02:21:55 1 convincing evidence that any of the following asserted
02:21:58 2 claims are invalid?

02:22:00 3 The jury has answered "no" to every one of the
02:22:09 4 claims, being Claims 1, 3, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 22 of the
02:22:17 5 '605 patent, and Claims 12, 13, 14, 20, 22, and 30 of the
02:22:24 6 '681 patent.

02:22:24 7 Turning then to Page 6 of the verdict form wherein
02:22:30 8 Question 3 is found: Did USAA prove by a preponderance of
02:22:36 9 the evidence that the infringement you found in Question
02:22:38 10 No. 1 was willful?

02:22:40 11 The jury's answer is: Yes.

02:22:44 12 Turning then to Page 7 wherein Question 4 is
02:22:52 13 found: What sum of money, if any, paid now in cash has
02:22:57 14 USAA proven by a preponderance of the evidence would
02:22:58 15 compensate USAA for its damages resulting from infringement
02:23:03 16 beginning on August the 17th, 2018, and through the date of
02:23:08 17 trial?

02:23:09 18 The jury's answer is: \$102 million --
02:23:21 19 \$102,792,510.00. I'll say that again. \$102,792,510.00.

02:23:30 20 Turning to the last page of the verdict form,
02:23:35 21 Page 8, I find that it's dated with today's date, and it's
02:23:39 22 signed by Mr. Travis Johns as foreperson of the jury.

02:23:41 23 Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, let me poll you
02:23:46 24 to make sure on the record that this is the unanimous
02:23:49 25 verdict of all eight members of the jury.

02:23:52 1 If this is your verdict as I have read it, would
02:23:56 2 you please stand?

02:23:58 3 (Jury polled.)

02:24:04 4 THE COURT: Thank you. Please be seated.

02:24:05 5 Let the record reflect that all eight members of
02:24:13 6 the jury immediately rose and stood in response to the
02:24:15 7 Court's question to poll them with regard to the unanimous
02:24:18 8 nature of the verdict, and the Court finds that this
02:24:20 9 verdict is the unanimous verdict of all eight members of
02:24:24 10 the jury.

02:24:24 11 The Court accepts the verdict, and I'll deliver
02:24:27 12 the original verdict to the courtroom deputy to be included
02:24:30 13 in the papers of this cause.

02:24:32 14 Ladies and gentlemen, that now -- this now
02:24:36 15 completes the trial of this case. From the very beginning,
02:24:40 16 I have instructed you, probably more times than you wanted
02:24:43 17 to hear, about not discussing this case with anyone and not
02:24:47 18 discussing it with each other until you retire to
02:24:50 19 deliberate.

02:24:50 20 I'm releasing you from those instructions, and I'm
02:24:53 21 releasing you from all the instructions I've given you. In
02:24:57 22 fact, I'm discharging you as jurors in this case.

02:25:00 23 That means, ladies and gentlemen, you're
02:25:02 24 absolutely free to talk about this case and your service
02:25:05 25 with anyone you'd like to. That also means you don't have

02:25:08 1 to talk to anybody about this case or your service if you
02:25:11 2 don't want to. The -- the decision is yours 100 percent
02:25:17 3 and no one else's.

02:25:18 4 And I will tell you that the custom and practice
02:25:21 5 in this court, at least for more than 35 years, because it
02:25:25 6 was that way when I started practicing law here in 1981, is
02:25:28 7 that members of this trial team, who would very much like
02:25:32 8 to know what you thought about the trial, whether they're
02:25:34 9 on the winning side or the losing side, would very much
02:25:38 10 like to have your input. But they are not able to initiate
02:25:40 11 a conversation with you. That's the practice here.

02:25:43 12 If they're going to hear from you in any regard,
02:25:47 13 it's going to be because -- it's going to be because you
02:25:50 14 chose to initiate a conversation with them.

02:25:52 15 That's your choice. And I suspect that, unless
02:25:58 16 the rain has already started, they'll probably be out on
02:26:02 17 the front steps as you leave the courthouse in hopes that
02:26:05 18 you want to stop and talk with them.

02:26:07 19 If you do, stop and talk. I promise you, they'll
02:26:10 20 be interested to hear from you.

02:26:12 21 If you don't want to discuss it, don't stop and
02:26:14 22 talk. No one's going to stop -- stop you. No one's going
02:26:17 23 to try to initiate a conversation with you. Again, it's
02:26:20 24 completely your decision.

02:26:21 25 Also, ladies and gentlemen, I want to tell you how

02:26:26 1 much the Court appreciates your service in this case. This
02:26:30 2 has been -- this has been a hard week for all of us, but
02:26:33 3 especially for you.

02:26:35 4 Many of you have had to drive a great distance to
02:26:38 5 get here every day and to get home at night. You stayed
02:26:42 6 late, as I told you we would, in hopes that we could get
02:26:45 7 this done in a week and not extend it into another week.

02:26:48 8 You've all made an important -- an important and a
02:26:51 9 significant sacrifice, and you've rendered a very important
02:26:55 10 public service by serving on this jury.

02:26:57 11 And I think it's worthy of -- of recognition,
02:27:01 12 appreciation, and thanks.

02:27:03 13 As a matter of fact, ladies and gentlemen, it's my
02:27:06 14 practice, since I've been on the bench, whenever I receive
02:27:09 15 a verdict in a case like this and I've accepted that
02:27:12 16 verdict and discharged the jury, to ask the jury to do me a
02:27:15 17 favor. I'm going to ask you to do me that favor right now.

02:27:19 18 And, that is, before you leave the building, I'd
02:27:21 19 like you, as you get up out of these seats in a few
02:27:25 20 minutes, I'd like you to go back to the jury room and let
02:27:27 21 me come into the jury room because I would like to shake
02:27:30 22 each one of your hands. I'd like to look each one of you
02:27:34 23 in the eye and tell you personally thank you for your
02:27:36 24 service to our nation and to the judiciary by serving in
02:27:40 25 this case as jurors.

02:27:41 1 I promise I won't keep you. But if you would
02:27:44 2 afford me a personal privilege of that type, I think it's
02:27:48 3 worthy of personal, individualized thanks for what you've
02:27:53 4 done.

02:27:53 5 And after that, you'll be free to go.

02:27:57 6 All right. I've accepted the verdict in this
02:28:02 7 case.

02:28:03 8 Ladies and gentlemen, if you'll meet me in the
02:28:05 9 jury room, I will be right there in just a moment.

02:28:08 10 Counsel, this case is now closed, and you are
02:28:11 11 excused.

02:28:12 12 The Court stands in recess.

02:28:14 13 COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.

02:28:15 14 (Court adjourned.)
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript from the stenographic notes of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter to the best of my ability.

/S/ Shelly Holmes
SHELLY HOLMES, CSR, TCRR
OFFICIAL REPORTER
State of Texas No.: 7804
Expiration Date: 12/31/20

1/10/2020
Date